





# THE JESUITS:

THEIR

ORIGIN AND ORDER, MORALITY AND PRACTICES,  
SUPPRESSION AND RESTORATION.

BY

ALEXANDER DUFF, D.D.,

ONE OF THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND'S MISSIONARIES, CALCUTTA.

THIRD EDITION.

JOHN JOHNSTONE,  
15 PRINCES STREET, EDINBURGH; AND  
26 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON.

---

M.DCCC.XLVIII.

on the west, and the multitudinous isles of Japan on the east, as its outposts, has converted "shuddering Europe" into one vast battle-field for the marshalled hosts of error and of truth.

*The Origin and Rise of the Jesuits.*

In 1521, Don Inigo Lopez de Ricalde, the youngest son of the noble house of Loyola, was severely wounded in both legs in the defence of Pampeluna against the French. Fired with the spirit of ancient chivalry, he had panted after knightly honours and renown. Excited by the vivid pictures of legendary romance, his mind was filled with airy dreams of hazardous adventure and feats of daring valour.

—————"Races and games,  
Or titling furniture, emblazoned shields,  
Impresses quaint, caparisons and steeds,  
Bases and tinsel trappings, gorgeous knights  
At joust and tournament."

But stretched on a bed of languishment, with shattered limbs, and little hope of their perfect recovery, how are these gorgeous phantasms to be grasped and realized? To these, alas! he must now bid farewell—farewell for ever. Does he then return to a calm composure of mind, resolved to content himself with the sober realities of life? No. Racked by disappointment and agitated by suffering, as he lay doomed to listless and pining inactivity on his couch, he happened to have had put into his hands a volume of the *Lives of the Saints*; whether by accident or design history telleth not. But, be that as it may, the effect on his excitable and chivalrous spirit was, in its instantaneousness and power, almost magical. The perusal of that work suddenly changed the entire current of his soul. "Behold," says his biographer, Vieyra, "behold the importance of reading good books! If it had been a book of knight errantry, Ignacio would have become a great knight errant; it was the *Lives of the Saints*, and Ignacio became a great saint. If he had read about knights, he might have proved a knight of the burning sword; he read about saints, and proved a saint of the burning torch." From that hour the chivalry of romance and worldly adventure is wholly and for ever abandoned for the chivalry of spiritual crusade and "fantastic asceticism." As ordinary knights were wont to "devote themselves and consecrate the valour of their arms to their lady love," he "hung up arms and armour before an image of the Virgin," determined to become "knight of the Virgin Mary." As other spiritual knight-errants had earned for themselves immortal renown by their self-imposed penances, he resolves to outstrip all his predecessors in austerity and self-denial. Accordingly, casting aside his knightly dress, and arraying himself in a hermit's homely garb, he withdraws from the abodes of luxurious refinement and the endearments of social intercourse. In cells and lonely caverns he enters on a course of the severest mortification, letting his hair and nails grow like those of the doomed and fated Nebuchadnezzar, maintaining midnight vigils—remaining seven hours daily on his bare knees—often fasting for days together, and one occasion from Sabbath to Sabbath—scourging himself regularly thrice a-day, and causing the gloomy cloisters to resound with the sighs and groans of heartfelt agony.

From that time, also, he began, in his turbid and troubled fancy, to enjoy all manner of visions, raptures, and ecstasies. Now, he is in rapt contemplation of two immense camps—"the one at Jerusalem, the other at Babylon—Christ's and Satan's. On that side all the good, on this side all the bad, both armed and ready for mutual combat"—while he himself figures as a chosen warrior in the army of the faithful. Again, he is satisfied that "he beholds at one time Christ, and at another the Virgin, with his bodily eyes." Standing on the steps of the Church of St Dominic at Manresa, "he wept aloud, because he beheld the mystery of the Trinity visibly revealed to him at that moment;" while the mystery of creation suddenly flashed upon him in mystic symbols. In the host he fancied that he "beheld him who was God and man." On the banks of the Llobregat he "sat down, and bent his eyes on the deep stream before him; when suddenly he felt himself in an ecstasy, wherein the mysteries of faith were visibly revealed to him. He rose up, he thought, another man."\* Favoured with such immediate inspirations and inward fantasies, the light of Scripture or revelation is rejected as altogether unnecessary. As a prime favourite of Heaven, he is privileged to hold direct communion with the invisible world and its inhabitants—privileged to ascend beyond the pure empyrean and mingle with the glories of the eternal regions; why, then, should he not spurn away from him the aids of apostles and prophets, who wrote only as they were commissioned for the humble denizens of this lower mundane sphere?

After journeying to Jerusalem on a fruitless expedition against the Infidels, and traversing, amid incredible hardships, different kingdoms of Europe, as a ragged, emaciated mendicant, he at length retired to Paris. There he soon gathered around him a small but enthusiastic body of converts and followers. They resolved to constitute themselves into a religious society. But under what designation are they to be known? Captivated with the thought of making war, as soldiers, against the prince of darkness, they finally determined, in accordance with Loyola's old military propensities, to call themselves "The Company of Jesus, just like a company of soldiers, who bear the name of their captain—a company, cohort, or century, as it were, engaged to do battle against spiritual enemies." But such an organized society must have laws. Doubtless. But whence are they to proceed? Whence, in such a case, but from the fountain-head of all law? Loyola had already his visions of the celestial world; before the altar of the church in Barcelona, the Lady Roselli saw him "with a radiant illumination round his head." Who, then, need be surprised at the solemn averment of his disciples, "that he was miraculously told from heaven to form his order, and instructed fully in a supernatural manner how to do it?"

After various abortive attempts, Loyola at length succeeded, in 1540, in obtaining from Paul III. a bull of constitution for his new order. This bull was fettered at first with certain unpalatable restrictions. The Pope, however, soon learned to estimate aright the prodigious importance of such a fraternity. Moreover, the offer, over and above the *three* usual vows of *poverty, chastity, and monastic obedience*, to come

\* See Ranke on the Popes.

under a *fourth* vow, of unlimited submission, of unconditional obedience to the Pope—whose absolute supremacy and infallibility the members of the new Society were sworn, at all hazards, to maintain; and whose commands to go wheresoever, whensoever, and on what errand soever he pleased, they were bound, without question or hesitation, instantly to obey; and all this under a solemn pledge, never and nowhere to require pecuniary aid or support from the See of Rome—such an offer, at such a desperate crisis of Papal affairs, proved irresistible. The original bull of confirmation was accordingly renewed in 1543, unembarrassed by any limitations or conditions whatsoever. And to render the deed still more memorable and impressive, the Pope had two medals struck, on one of which, in allusion to the important services which he expected from the Society, was inscribed: “The gates of heaven opened!” and on the other: “The security of the Roman people.”

As the Society was essentially military and despotic in its constitution, the next important step was to elect a general or commander-in-chief, who, as stated by the Society itself, in the first draft of the constitution which they presented to the Pope, “should dispense grades and offices as to him should seem fit; project the plan of the constitution for the order, with the advice and assistance of the members; and in all other matters exercise *sole and undivided* command: in him should *Christ be honoured* (let this blasphemy be noted) *as present in his person!*” The choice, as might readily be anticipated, fell on the founder, Loyola, who, according to the express words of one of the electors, “had begotten them all in Christ, and fed them with his milk.” Another reason assigned by a Jesuit writer is too characteristic to be omitted here. “Since Peter,” says he, “had more zeal than the rest of the apostles, when he struck the servant of the high priest, it is for this reason among others, we may conceive, that the sovereign priesthood was committed to him by Christ; and, if the comparison be admissible, we may affirm that Ignatius was chosen to be general of our order because he would kill a Moor who had blasphemed.”

The Society having obtained the Papal sanction, and elected its general, the next grand step was to frame its constitution. This task was executed by Loyola with such consummate ability, as to justify the eulogium of Pasquier, who pronounced him “one of the most subtle and skilful politicians which his age produced.” For two hundred years, the mysterious volume was systematically concealed from the world at large; while its contents were only gradually unfolded, and that, too, after full proof of their trustworthiness and repeated oaths of secrecy, even to the members of the Society; yea, some rules there were of which none but the general and superiors were ever permitted to know anything at all. One of the assistants of the order, in a letter from Rome, towards the middle of last century, thus writes: “It is only since my arrival here that I understand anything of the nature of our Society. Its government is a separate science, of which the provincials themselves know nothing. It is necessary to be in the post which I now occupy, to begin to comprehend it.”

At length, however, in an evil hour for the Society, but a providential one for the cause of humanity and truth, their long secreted statute-

book was dragged to light. This occurred in the course of the celebrated suit of Lionci and La Valette, in France, in 1761.

From these authentic records everything essential may now be learned respecting the organization, government, and general principles of the institute. In order to invest these with infallible authority, the Jesuits did not scruple to allege "that God himself dictated the formation of their Society;" that "He and the blessed Virgin inspired its plans, rules, and privileges, in miraculous revelations." In order to allure numbers to join their ranks, they positively declared that "God had granted to every member of the Society, who might join it in the three first centuries, *the privilege of escaping damnation*; and that whoever should die in communion with the Society should obtain everlasting felicity." Under the influence of such flattering attractions, the increase of the Society, like that of a comet approaching its perihelion, was more than ordinarily rapid. In little more than half a century after its commencement, its full sworn members exceeded *ten thousand*. A century later still, it could reckon *twenty thousand members*, and upwards of *six hundred colleges*.

All this will appear the more surprising, when we reflect on the dreadful ordeal of probation through which every candidate must pass ere he could obtain the privilege of full membership. Talk of drilling and discipline!—why, the drilling and the discipline which gave to Alexander the men that marched in triumph from Macedon to the Indus; to Cæsar, the men that marched in triumph from Rome to the wilds of Caledonia; to Hannibal, the men that marched in triumph from Carthage to Rome; to Napoleon, the men whose achievements surpassed in brilliancy the united glories of the soldiers of Macedon, of Carthage, and of Rome; and to Wellington, the men who smote into the dust the very flower of Napoleon's chivalry—why, the drilling and the discipline of all of these combined, cannot, in point of stern, rigid, and protracted severity, for a moment be compared to the drilling and discipline which fitted and moulded men for becoming full members of the militant institute of the Jesuits!

Into details we cannot enter; but a few leading particulars we must supply from the most authoritative of all sources—the *book of their own constitutions*.

### *The Order of the Jesuits—its Organization and Government.*

The whole world, which is regarded by the general as his one and undivided empire, is parcelled out into provinces; at the head of which is a provincial, subordinate to the general central head. Throughout the provinces are colleges and novitiates, or houses of probation and residence; at the head of which are rectors, prefects, or superiors; all subordinate directly, or through the provincials, to the general, who is the sole mainspring and moving power of the stupendous mechanism, throughout all its countless parts and wide-spreading ramifications.

The whole Society may be divided into four classes—the novices, the scholars, the coadjutors, and the professed or full members. The age of *fourteen* is ordinarily the earliest for admission as a novice;

and the age of *thirty-three* the earliest for the attainment of full or *professed* membership.

When a candidate for admission presents himself, he is rigidly examined. If deemed unfit, he is instantly dismissed. If his fitness appear probable, he is received into "the house of primary probation." A fresh scrutiny is then instituted into his rank, temper, and condition—his talents, possessions, and probable utility—natural abilities being allowed "to make ample atonement for poverty, and wealth for lack of talent." Every communication with the servants or strangers, either by word or letter, is expressly forbidden. A brief compendium or summary of general rules is then submitted to his deliberation. In subsequent examinations, "every circumstance is drawn from him connected with his birth, his family, and connexions. Strict inquiry is made touching the marriage or celibacy of a brother or sister—their state and manner of life; but, above all, whether he be bound himself by a promise of marriage." Again, "the health and perfection of the candidate's body must, by medical inspection, be ascertained. The manner in which his life has been spent from his youth, the bent of his inclinations, the substance of his prayers, the fervour of his devotions—all must be revealed, without reserve, at the bidding of the scrutinizing inquirer." The applicant must next be asked, "whether he has ever held, or still continues to hold, any opinions or ideas differing from those which are maintained by the Church, and approved by her doctors; for novel opinions cannot be tolerated." And "in every scruple or spiritual difficulty which may arise, he must engage to abandon his own decision." If he has property, he must next declare his resolution of renouncing it, and giving it wholly "*to the poor* (*i.e.*, in reality to 'the Society of Jesuits, who are *mendicants* for that purpose'), without a hope of regaining it at any time." And that "his better example may shine before men, he must put away all strong affection for his parents, and refrain from the unsuitable desire of a bountiful distribution towards them, arising from such a disadvantageous affection, that the precept of the gospel may be followed more perfectly, which says not, 'Give to your relations,' but, 'Give to the poor.' Thus effectually cut off from all access to his parents, and even from a useless remembrance of them, he may proceed more surely in his course of hopeful vocation." To render his seclusion more complete, the candidate is next "interdicted from verbal or written communication with his family or friends," unless under special permission from the superior. He must also be "satisfied that all letters written and received by him, as long as he remains in the house, should be opened, read, and delivered up for that purpose, to the person appointed to examine him." His "actions, errors, and deficiencies, are always closely watched, and reported to the superior by any one who has observed or discovered them." A general confession of the "whole past life must be made, and repeated every six months, to some Jesuit priest, who may be deputed by the superior to receive it."

The course of primary probation being at length concluded, the candidate enters the house of second probation, where he joins the *senior novices*. Here, on his entrance, six principal exercises or experiments await him. *First*, He must devote a month to self-examina-



tion, confession, and meditation. *Second*, He must serve for another month "in one or more of the hospitals, by ministering to the sick, in proof of increasing humility." *Third*, He "must wander for another month, without money, begging from door to door, that he may be accustomed to inconvenience in eating and sleeping." *Fourth*, He "must submit to be employed in the most servile offices of the house into which he has entered." *Fifth*, He must exhibit his capacity for giving instruction to boys and untaught elders. *Sixth*, He must try his gift in preaching and hearing confessions.

As yet, while thus only "fulfilling his several trials of fitness, he may not presume to say that he is a member of the Society. If his discharge of these six experiments be not satisfactory, he is summarily dismissed; if otherwise, he is encouraged to wait in patient expectation—learning, by further exercises, to subordinate his mind and will, in all things, in perfect humility and obedience, to the dictum of the general or superior. If his progress be satisfactory, the *three* simple vows are administered at the end of *two* years; which vows, with slight and suitable modifications, must ever after be renewed twice every year."

The novitiate being at length terminated, the candidate, who has acquitted himself with credit in the houses of probation, is admitted to additional instruction in the mysteries of the institute in one or other of the colleges or universities, which are richly endowed by the voluntary liberality of the superstitiously devout. He now becomes one of the grade or class of *scholars*. The qualities to be "desired and commended in *scholars* are acuteness of talent, brilliancy of example, and soundness of body. They are to be chosen men, picked from the flower of the troop; and the general has absolute power in admitting or dismissing them, according to his expectations of their utility in promoting the designs of the institute." If they have satisfactorily passed the time and course of their studies, they become *approved scholars*, and must submit to new varieties of trial and probation.

The trial of their perfections, as *approved scholars*, being completed, they are admitted into the *third* class, which is that of *coadjutors*, temporal and spiritual. Their trials, which are multiform, protracted, and severe, being finished, they are at last admitted into the *fourth* class, which, by way of eminence, is distinguished as the "*Professed Society*." *These* take upon them the *fourth* or *peculiar* vow, which binds them to proceed, without question or murmur, on the Papal missions, to any region of the earth. Their probations are even "more strict and of longer duration, than those of the preceding classes." Schedules or registers are carefully kept throughout, in which the minutest particulars are recorded, for the inspection of the superior, and for transmission to the general; who has thus before him, at one view, a complete chart or map of the character, talents, and special qualifications of every candidate and member of the Society, from the earliest period of the novitiate to the conclusion of a finished profession.

Here, in passing, we may note a characteristic circumstance. One of the earliest and most solemn vows taken, is that of *perpetual* poverty. But what if, in consequence of the death of friends or relations, some property should fall to be inherited by one who had taken the vow of

utter renunciation of the world—is he precluded from asserting his lawful claims? Why, then, the superior is armed with power *temporarily* to release him from the solemn and unconditional obligation of the vow. Thus liberated, and, by a Jesuit fiction, regarded for a definite season as a merely *secular* person, he is sent forth swiftly to secure property, “as an eagle to the prey. But as the lesser bird, which decoys to the snare of the fowler, can only enjoy the liberty which is allowed by the length of his string and the will of his master, so must the richly laden Jesuit return at the bidding of his general; and bound up once more by his former vow of renouncing the things of this world, he is quickly relieved of his acquired wealth, which is safely deposited in the craving and capacious coffers of the Society.”

But the grand principle which pervades, animates, and cements into one firm and continuous chain the entire course of probationary exercises, is the reiterated, the incessant, the perpetual inculcation of a blind, implicit, unquestioning obedience to the monarchical general of the order, or to the superior acting in his stead and name. In every conceivable variety of shape and form, his will is declared to be law, sole and supreme law—his will is virtually that of omnipotence. To him must the inclinations, the reason, and the conscience, of every member be unconditionally surrendered. Does any one doubt the possibility of a despotism so absolute? Then hear the express words of the constitutions. There the novice is exhorted to “devote himself to the service of God, leaving the care of all other things to his superior, *who doubtless* (mark these words) *holds the place of Christ our Lord.*” But this is a brief and ambiguous expression, you will say. Very good. Then, here is another: Let the novices “desire with perfect concurrence to be guided by them (their superiors); and not wishing to be led by *their own judgment*, except it agrees with that of those who are to them *instead of Christ our Lord.*”

Is this not explicit enough? Well, here is another injunction: “It is especially conducive to advancement, nay, even necessary, that *all yield themselves to perfect obedience, regarding the superior* (be he who he may) *as Christ the Lord*, and submitting to him with inward reverence and affection. Let them obey not only in the outward performance of what he enjoins, entirely, promptly, resolutely, and with all due humility, without excuses or murmurs, even though he order things hard to be done, and repugnant to their own sense; but let them also strive to acquire *perfect resignation and denial* of their own will and judgment to that which the superior wills and judges (where sin is not perceived)—the will and judgment of the superior being set before them as the rule of their will and judgment.”

Is any further confirmation wanted? Then, surely, it is in these words: “Let every one persuade himself that they who live under obedience, should permit themselves to be moved and directed, under Divine Providence, by their superiors *just as if* (mark the similes), *just as if they were a corpse, which allows itself to be moved and handled in any way; or as the staff of an old man, which serves him wherever or in whatever thing he who holds it in his hand pleases to use it*”—“persuading themselves that everything is just, suppressing every repugnant thought and judgment of their own, in a certain obedience,” and

“promptly attending to their voice, just as if it proceeded from Christ our Lord.” And, to render assurance doubly sure, every disciple is again and again bound by solemn oath to “obey superiors,” and “to understand all things according to the constitutions of the Society,” the oaths of submission and obedience usually commencing in this style: “I, *N. B.*, make profession, and promise Almighty God, before his virgin mother, and before all the heavenly host, and before all bystanders, and you, reverend father, general of the Society of Jesus, *holding the place of God*, and your successors, reverend father, vice-general of the Society of Jesus, *holding the place of God*,” &c. And lest any one might suppose that the *formal* introduction of any apparently extraordinary clauses respecting the non-obligation of committing sin by way of obedience, formed any real or substantial limitation, it is expressly added, by way of explanation, that the constitutions of the Society do not “involve an obligation to commit sin, mortal or venial;” *unless* (mark the impious exception), the superior command them in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, or in virtue of holy obedience; which shall be done in those cases or persons wherein it shall be judged that it will greatly conduce to the particular good of each, or to the general advantage.” What does this mean? Neither more nor less than this, that sins against God, acts contrary to his revealed Word, transgressions of his pure and holy law—provided only they benefit the individual or the Society—may be, yea, must be committed, *if* the superior enjoins them! What is this, but setting himself in the place of God, yea, exalting himself above God? For surely, that authority which can annul, repeal, supersede, or abrogate a law, must be supreme and paramount above all other authorities.

And lest any one, in the plenitude of his sceptical liberality or liberal scepticism, should suppose, or pretend to suppose, that we had misunderstood or overstrained the meaning of these clear declarations, let us hear the statements of Jesuits themselves as to their understanding of the spirit and import of their own constitutions and vows of unqualified obedience. Instances might be given both of a comic and a tragic character. Of Friar Alphonso, who was the porter at a college in Majorca, it is related by one of his own brother-associates, that, having “denied himself, in the way of penance, a part of the victuals allowed for his subsistence, the superior, to whom a report was made of the fact, commanded him to eat all that was set before him. To fulfil the sacred duty of obedience, Father Alphonso ate his whole allowance, champed even the plates on which it was served, and would have swallowed them, had not the superior told him that his obedience must not proceed beyond the glazing of the earthen ware.” Another practical instance and proof of the length to which implicit obedience would carry its votaries, is supplied by the Romish Abbé de la Roche Arnauld, who himself went through many of the preliminaries of the Jesuit novitiate. He tells us of the case of a young novice, who, when

\* For all the quotations given in this epitomized account of the order of the Jesuits the reader is referred to two standard and authoritative works:—1st, *Constitutiones Societatis Jesu*, Anno 1558, Romæ, in *Ædibus Societatis Jesu*, 1558. *Reprinted from the original edition*, &c., &c., London, 1838; and, 2d, The preliminary Sketch prefixed to a work entitled “The Principles of the Jesuits, developed in a collection of extracts from their writings, London, 1839.”

asked by his master concerning the sacrifice of Abraham, and that of St Marius, who went to throw his son into a furnace to please his superior, promptly and unhesitatingly replied: "I would have done still more. Were God to order me, *through the voice of my superior*, to put to death father, mother, children, brothers, and sisters, I would do it with an eye as tearless and a heart as calm as if I were seated at the banquet of the paschal lamb!"

Well, surely, might Robertson the historian exclaim, that "there is not in the annals of mankind any example of such a perfect despotism, exercised not over monks shut up in the cells of a convent, but over men dispersed among all the nations of the earth."

But, lest any one should presume to surmise that this is a Protestant conclusion merely, and not a fair representation of the case, we shall adduce a testimony that must be held by Romanists themselves as wholly unimpeachable. Here is a description and denunciation of the Jesuit institute: "In order to form the union, the consistency, and the strength of the Society, there should be a government not only monarchical, but so sovereign, so absolute, so despotic, that even the provincials themselves should not have it in their power, by any act of theirs, to resist or retard the execution of the orders of the general. By this legislative, inviolable, and despotic power—by the profound devotedness of the subjects of this Company to mysterious laws with which they are not themselves acquainted—by the blind and passive obedience by which they are compelled to execute, without hesitation or reply, whatever their superiors command—this Society is at once become the most consolidated and powerful body, and at the same time the greatest and most enormous of abuses, to which there is an urgent necessity that the Church and State should apply the most prompt and efficacious remedy." Who has furnished this bold outline, this vigorous draft, this powerful sketch of the "most absolute of despotisms," the "most enormous of abuses?" Doubtless some Protestant calumniator—some mortal enemy to Rome. No such thing. It happens to be none other than one of the most loyal and devoted adherents of the holy See—the Romish King of Portugal. It is from the public manifesto addressed to his bishops in 1759, that the words now quoted have been taken.

What, it may now be asked, in more definite terms, what was the precise function to be discharged by an army so equipped, so marshalled, so trained? On what particular enterprise was it to embark? What specific object of attainment was to constitute the prize of its ambition and the monument of its success?

To these questions the answer may be a very brief one. Without entering into details, we may simply remind you of the grand historical fact, that, in some countries of Europe, towards the middle of the sixteenth century, the once absolute and universal supremacy of the Pope, and with it the Popish cause generally, had been wholly destroyed; nearly so in others; and greatly shaken in all. Now, *the* one paramount end of Jesuitism, yea, the one sole end for which it existed at all, may be compendiously stated to have been to uphold that supremacy inviolable and unchangeable. What, then, is to be done, where such supremacy has been entirely lost, or is threatened with decline? What

but to regain and restore it to its wonted ascendancy? But what means could prove most efficacious? This may be at once seen, by asking, What occasioned the loss of the Pope's supremacy? Was it not the Reformation of Luther, with its renovating spirit and life-giving principles? Then, surely, the most direct and effectual way of restoring the lost supremacy, must be to beat down into the dust its mighty antagonist—the Reformation.

This, this, then, was the gigantic task which the Jesuits undertook, and long continued to prosecute with a zeal unquenched, and an ability unrivalled—a zeal and an ability which, in a just or noble cause, would have challenged an applause as unbounded as it must now call forth unmitigated and immitigable execration. This Herculean design is thus truly and characteristically stated by one of the earliest historians of the order. “In the same year (1521) Luther,” says he, “with consummate wickedness, openly declared war against the Church; wounded in the fortress of Pampeluna, renovated and strengthened by his accident, Ignatius raised the standard in defence of religion. Luther attacks the Chair of St Peter with abuse and blasphemy; Ignatius is miraculously cured by St Peter, in order to become its defence. Luther, like a madman declaims against the Apostolic See; Ignatius everywhere undertakes its defence. Luther withdraws from it as many as he can; Ignatius reconciles and restores to it. All the devices and efforts of Luther are directed against it; Ignatius consecrates to it, by a special vow, all his own labours and those of his companions. To Luther, that disgrace of Germany, that Epicurean hog, that curse of Europe, that monster destructive to the whole earth, hateful to God and man, God, by his eternal decree, has opposed Ignatius.”

Thus authoritatively does it appear that the Reformation, which had wrenched the half of Christendom from the Papal grasp, and caused the other to hang tremulous or oscillating in apparent indecision, must be checked arrested, and, if possible, utterly destroyed; and to achieve this object was the primary and paramount end contemplated by Ignatius and his followers, constituting “the Society of Jesus.”

In order to accomplish this end the more effectually, *two* distinct objects immediately and urgently presented themselves. The *one* was to *enlarge* the bounds of the Papal dominion, and, by extending the Papal sceptre over foreign lands and distant realms, to call in a new world to redress the balance of the old; hence the *Papal missions*! The *other* was, to commence throughout Europe a war of retaliation and aggression on the Reformers, the Reformed communities, and Reformation principles. In attempting to compass these two great objects, by one wide and multiform, yet simultaneous process, the spirit and genius of Rome, through the child of her strength and the instrument of her power—Jesuitism—were conspicuously displayed.

“The Society of Jesus” being thus expressly, and by its very constitution, designed for action—vigorous, energetic, wide-spread action—it had special exemptions and immunities accorded to it, the better to fit and qualify it for its peculiar vocation. Of every other monastic or religious society connected with the Papacy, it has been truly remarked, that the immediate design was “to separate its members from the world; that of the Jesuits to render them masters of the world. The

inmate of the convent devoted himself to work out his own salvation by extraordinary acts of devotion and self-denial; the follower of Loyola considered himself as plunging into all the bustle of secular affairs, to maintain the interests of the Romish Church. The monk was a retired devotee of heaven; the Jesuit a chosen soldier of the Pope. That the members of the new order might have full leisure for this active service, they were exempted from the usual functions of other monks. They were not required to spend their time in the long ceremonial offices and numberless mummeries of the Romish worship. They were required to attend no processions—to practise no austerities. They neither chanted nor prayed. ‘They cannot sing,’ said their opponents; ‘for birds of prey never do.’ They are sent forth to watch every transaction of the world which might appear to affect the interests of Rome.” To them also was extended, by the Court of Rome, a special license to trade with the nations of the earth—a license which speedily paved the way for an extensive and lucrative commerce with all the richest countries of the Old and New Worlds.

Behold, then, “in the Society of Jesus,” what has been emphatically termed “the formidable militia of the Roman See!”—knit together as one man, yea, rather fused and molten into one mass, under the uncontrollable will and mandate of the superior—a living, moving mass, which has been well compared to a mechanism containing “the greatest possible quantity of power distributed to the greatest possible advantage;” or, more briefly, to a tremendous “*naked sword, whose hilt was at Rome.*”

Behold, in this Society, an army of chosen soldiers, bound by oath to exert themselves continually in the service of the superior, and of the Pope, as their vice-Christ and vice-God! In other armies the leaders, the captains, and the generals, are few in number. Ninety-nine in a hundred are utterly unfit to be leaders themselves, and utterly helpless without them. But, in the army of Jesuits, each individual is a picked and chosen man, himself fit, in his own appointed sphere, to become a leader, a captain, or a general, yea, a chieftain among leaders. In other armies that have achieved deeds of undying fame, there have been unity and combination of movement and action; but, in point of oneness of mind, singleness of purpose, simultaneousness of action, and terribleness of execution, what army, in ancient or in modern times, is fit to be compared with that of the Jesuits? Why, in these respects, the Roman legion, the Macedonian phalanx, the British regiment, or all of these united, are no more worthy of being named in comparison, than that “small infantry warred on by cranes” is worthy of being named in comparison with the mightiest “embodied force” of “mortal prowess”—

---

“ Though all the giant brood  
 Of Phlegra with th’ heroic race were joined  
 That fought at Thebes and Ilium, on each side  
 Mix’d with auxiliar gods; and what resounds  
 In fable or romance of Uther’s son  
 Begirt with British and Armoric knights;  
 And all who since, baptized or infidel,  
 Jousted at Aspramont, or Montalban,

Damasco, or Morocco, or Trebisond;  
 Or whom Biserta sent from Afric shore,  
 When Charlemagne with all his peerage fell  
 By Fontarabia."

And, finally, behold, in this Society of Jesus, a sworn confederacy for the revival of the reign of ignorance—the full restoration of the yoke of Papal despotism. Behold in it a fell and terrible confederacy against the rights of conscience, and the civil and religious liberties, not of Europe only, but of the world!

Nor was it less successful than it was fell and terrible. No sooner had it been formed, than its authors and emissaries, with surprising rapidity, overran the whole globe. Most of the schools and colleges of Europe, came under their management and control. To most of its monarchs they became confessors—a function, as has been observed "of no small importance, in any reign, but under a weak prince superior even to that of minister." In most of its cabinets and courts their counsel and policy were all-prevailing. In most of its corporate bodies, civil and ecclesiastical, their mysterious presence was felt with all the effect of a secret and resistless energy. As the spiritual guides of the largest proportion of its wealthiest, noblest, and most powerful families, their all but ubiquitous influence extended to almost every domestic circle from the cottage to the palace—to almost every individual from the peasant to the prince. In a word, their empire and dominion over the souls and persons of men seemed unbounded, and threatened to be eternal.

And what was the natural and inevitable result of an influence so universal, an antagonism so resistless? It was this, that in many of the Heathen states and empires of Asia, Africa, and America, their *missions*, for a season, were crowned with a temporal prosperity which wore the air of marvel and romance; and that, throughout the bounds of old Christendom, the tide of the glorious Reformation, everywhere arrested, was in many parts wholly rolled back. Everything appeared to indicate a speedy relapse into stagnation of repressed energy and fettered thought. The light of a resuscitated Evangelism, everywhere bedimmed, was in many parts wholly extinguished; while everything betokened a quick return to the gloom of a scaled mental vision and cloudy firmament; and if the fertilizing stream of Reformation has not everywhere putresced, or its reviving light everywhere gone out, or its joyous liberty everywhere become extinct, no thanks to the men who have toiled with such desperate vigour to realize so fatal, so disastrous a consummation. To Him, to Him alone, "who doeth according to his will among the armies of heaven and the inhabitants of the earth," be all the praise, and all the glory!

Fairly, and most naturally, may it now be asked, How, or in what way, came they to possess and wield so stupendous an influence? What were the means—the agencies—the weapons employed? Not, we may be sure, the temporal sword directly; for, had they met their enemies boldly and openly in the battle-field, there are yet, even in these days of cold-hearted and mercenary selfishness, patriots enough in Christendom, who, in defence of freedom's cause, would have converted many a

barren plain and many a rugged pass into another and a nobler Marathon—another and a more renowned Thermopylæ. Not, we may be sure, the “sword of the Spirit,” the Word of the living God, which is powerful in combating principalities and powers, and spiritual wickednesses, and in bringing down the strongholds of sin and Satan, throughout the realms of Gentilism; for ends so sinister and unholy as theirs could not brook the employment of a weapon of such ethereal temper; or, if they could, such a weapon, like the touch of Ithuriel’s spear, would soon unmask the treachery, and cause each cunning artifice to stand forth to view in its own proper shape and likeness. No!—the means employed were as unscrupulous as the end, and as complex and multitudinous as the end itself was simple and one.

The great leading and avowed object being, as has been remarked, “to establish a spiritual dominion over the minds of men, of which the Pope should appear as the ostensible head, while the real power should reside with themselves, nothing could divert them from it. No means were ever scrupled at which promised to aid its accomplishment. They were in no degree shackled by prejudice, superstition, or real religion. Expediency, in its most simple and licentious form, was the basis of their morals; and their principles and practices were uniformly accommodated to the circumstances in which they were placed. Even their bigotry, obdurate as it was, never appears to have interfered with their interests. The paramount and characteristic principle of the order, from which none of its members ever swerved, was simply this, *that its interests were to be promoted by all possible means—at all possible expense.* In order to acquire more easily an ascendancy over persons of rank and power, they propagated a system of the most relaxed morality, which accommodated itself to the passions of men, justified their vices, tolerated their imperfections, and authorized almost every action which the most audacious or crafty politician could wish to perpetrate. To persons of stricter principles they studied to recommend themselves by the purity of their lives, and sometimes by the austerity of their doctrines. ‘They are a sort of people,’ said the Abbé Boileau, ‘who lengthen the creed and shorten the decalogue.’”

No wonder though, under the predominant influence of a system so boundlessly accommodative to all that is corrupt and perverse in the nature of man—a system so immensely elastic under every conceivable variety of circumstances—the Jesuits should so speedily have climbed to the very zenith in the firmament of misbegotten power.

And this naturally brings us to one main object of the present Lecture, which is to portray, in faithful and authentic colours

### *The Morality of the Jesuits.*

Sure I am, that if a serious contemplation of the great end pursued by them cannot fail to inspire you with a feeling of wholesome dread and terror, that feeling cannot be diminished, but rather mightily increased, by the like contemplation of the morality which freely allowed the most sinister means to be employed in its prosecution; and, in descending from generalities to particulars, with the view of impugning their maxims of morality, I beg it, at the very outset to be clearly and



distinctly understood that I shall quote no Protestant author whatsoever. The *sole* authorities to which I intend to refer shall be accredited Jesuit authorities, and none other. The Jesuit morality is to be impanelled or put on its trial. The charge against it is a tremendous one. It is neither more nor less than this, that it violates, and systematically teaches how to violate with impunity, every precept of the decalogue. You, that is, the miscellaneous audience now before me, are called on to act the part of an impartial jury. On me has devolved the painful duty of presenting myself before you, in the invidious attitude, the unenviable relationship, of public accuser and prosecutor. But my heart's desire is to act in this matter with the most rigid justice—the most unchallengeable impartiality; and in proof of this my honesty and integrity of purpose, I hereby again declare that I shall not summon into the witness-box a single testator, who is not himself, not merely a friend, but an adherent, yea, and a veritable champion of Jesuitism; so that, if the verdict of “Guilty” must be returned by you, and the sentence of condemnation must be pronounced by me, such verdict and sentence shall be founded exclusively on evidence, redundant evidence, derived from the most indubitable of all sources, even the standard writings of the Jesuit authors themselves.

These writings are at once voluminous and authoritative; for while the general, as has been remarked, is, strictly speaking, “the *soul* of the Society, still, in a larger sense of that descriptive term, the professed members, acting under his sole superintendence, must be considered as included in it. They were the casuists of the order. Their hours of retirement were occupied in brooding over its principles; in extending the sphere of their operation, by further subtleties and refinements; and in composing digests and manuals to facilitate their application. It is to the literary labours, therefore, of these casuists, that reference must be made for a complete development of the Jesuitical system.” Now, from the avowed and published works of these Jesuit authors copious extracts and selections have often been made. In this department of research and criticism, Pascal and Arnauld, and the author of “A Parallel of the Doctrine of the Pagans with the Doctrine of the Jesuits,” and many more besides, have distinguished themselves, and immortalized their services in the cause of truth and righteousness. But the most elaborate and authoritative collection of extracts is that which was made by a judicial assembly above all suspicion of garbling evidence—a special commission of the Parliament of France—consisting of *five* princes of the blood, four peers of France, seven presidents of the Court, thirteen counsellors of the Grand Chamber, and fourteen other public functionaries. The whole collection extracted from not fewer than *one hundred and forty-seven accredited Jesuit authors*, and forming a large quarto, was published by authority in 1762, as verified and collated by the commissioners of Parliament.

With such works, or large and authenticated selections therefrom, before us, our task will be comparatively an easy one; inasmuch as it must mainly consist in extracting, condensing, and arranging. Indeed, with such redundant materials in our possession, the only difficulty is to determine what parts ought, for our purpose, to be chosen; where and how to begin; or, once beginning, where and how to end.

Here, however, it is as well, *in limine*, to repel two plausible objections or evasions.

*First*, It has been alleged that Jesuitism is no Popery, and that it is not fair to make the Pope or the Popish polity responsible for it.

Now, we maintain that if, by any verbal quibble, Jesuitism be declared to be not Popery in its *ordinary* form, then must it be held, either as the essence (*i. e.*, the essential spirit of Popery), or as that spirit in its last manifestation and most perfect development. What the cream is to the milk, what the laudanum is to the poppy, what the alcohol is to the grape, or what any other extract, essence, or quintessence is to the substance whence it is drawn, that is Jesuitism to Popery. Or, if this do not satisfy, then, what the croaking frog is to the tadpole, what the roaring lion is to the cub, what the sturdy knarled oak is to the sapling, or what any other fully developed animal or vegetable form is to its seed, or germ, or youngling, that is Jesuitism to Popery. But be this as it may, we hold it to be absolutely demonstrable that for Jesuitism Popery is out and out responsible. What induced Paul III. to grant his bull of constitution? Was it not the fourth or supplementary vow, by which all the professed members of the Society "solemnly bound themselves to the sovereign Pontiff and his successors, to go whithersoever they might choose to command them?" These, then, *by the fundamental conditions of their very constitution*, are the sworn missionaries of the Roman See—the accredited agents of its aggressions alike on Protestantism and Heathenism—the authorized or officially delegated instruments of its power in re-assuring friends and proselyting foes. And, inasmuch as the master is answerable for the official sayings and doings of his sworn and trusty agents, while sanctioned and upheld by his authority, this circumstance alone were enough to make Popery responsible for Jesuitism. But this is not all. Here is an edict that will bind that responsibility faster still. In the second bull of Pius III., 1543, the Society is expressly authorized "to adopt such constitutions as they may judge fit, with power, as well with respect to the constitutions already adopted as those which should be made in future, to alter or annul them, according to the difference of time and place, and the qualities and diversities of things; and to form other constitutions, which, by special favour (mark this,) shall be, *ipso facto*, considered as approved by the Holy See." Subsequent bulls, particularly those of 1549, 1682, and 1684, have fully ratified and confirmed this plenary Papal license. Here the head of the Church, in plain and unambiguous terms, assumes, by anticipation, the full and absolute responsibility. But, it may be alleged that two Popes at least were shamed into issuing bulls against some of their proceedings. True, when their pernicious principles and practices excited a general indignation, which threatened to shake the throne of the Vatican, such bulls were, *pro forma*, by way of feint or pretext, sent forth; but such prime favourites were the Jesuits at Rome, that these bulls were soon suppressed, and, in point of fact, are not to be found in the *Bullarium Pontificum*. Nay, more: when, in Portugal, some of the members were found guilty of conspiracy against the life of the king, the Pope peremptorily refused his consent to the execution of the sentence of the law. And, when expelled from that kingdom for high misdemeanours,

did he not receive them with ovations of triumph in Italy? True, it may be said; but did not Clement XIV., in 1773, by a bull, suppress the order altogether? Admitted; but, up to that date, was not everything said and done under the signet of Papal infallibility? And, what is more to our purpose, did not Pope Pius IV., in 1814, by another bull, wholly “reverse the decree of his predecessor, legalize the vows of that so often prohibited Society, and place it in a condition to exercise, in all countries of the world, its former discipline?” Yea, moreover, did not “the head of the Church of Rome,” as recently expressed by a dignitary of the Church of England, “restore this Society in all its plenitude, neither accompanying his rescript with any refutation or denial of the odious doctrines and practices which had been imputed to it, nor expressing his own disapprobation of them, nor so much as giving a public caution against their re-introduction?” In every way, therefore, must Popery be held responsible for Jesuitism, past and present.

*Secondly*, It has been alleged as unfair that the principles of individual Jesuit authors should be charged home indiscriminately on the whole body.

In the case of any other Society, the force of this reclamation might, to a greater or less extent, be admitted; but in the case of the Jesuits such admission, in any form, however qualified, is utterly impossible; for, what are the facts of the case? Is it not the fact, that one of the most stringent oaths exacted of every novice, scholar, coadjutor, and professed member, is, that he hold no private or peculiar opinion of his own—no opinion different from that of his superior—no opinion at variance with the entire corporate brotherhood? This alone were sufficient to establish a verdict of common or joint responsibility. But this is not all. Has not the Society rather boastingly supplied us with express “identifications of itself in opinion and doctrine with all its individual members?” What says Father Le Moyne, in 1726? “It is not a slight testimony in our favour, that in these troublous times not one among us has changed or wavered. Uniformity on this point will always remain the same.” What says Gretser in his defence of the Society? “It is not from obscure descriptions that an opinion of the doctrines of the Jesuits can be formed, *but from their books*; which, by the blessing of God, are already very numerous.” And again: “There are many theological works written by the doctors of the Society. We profess *the same doctrine* in a vast number of places, both privately and publicly in the schools.” Still more emphatic are the assertions of the celebrated author of the history of his Society’s operations during the first century of its existence. “The members of the Society,” says he, “are dispersed through every corner of the world, distinguished by as many nations and kingdoms as the earth has intersections; but this is a division arising from diversity of place, *not of opinion*—a difference of language, *not of affection*—a dissimilarity of countenance, *not of morals*. In this association, the Latin thinks with the Greek, the Portuguese with the Brazilian, the Irishman with the Sarmatian, the Englishman with the Belgian; and among so many different dispositions there is no strife—no contention—*nothing which affords opportunity of discovering that they are more than one*. *The same design, the same manner of life, the same uniting vow, combines them*. The pleasure

of a single individual (the general) can cause the whole Society to turn and return, and determine the revolution of this numerous body, which is easily moved, but with difficulty shaken."

But we must now proceed to the actual proof of our charge, viz., that the Jesuit morality does violate, yea, and systematically teaches how to violate with impunity, every precept of the decalogue. And, *first*, there are *certain general principles adopted and enforced by the Jesuits, which alone are sufficient to sap the foundations of all morality.*

The first of these which I shall notice is the celebrated *doctrine of probability*. The doctrine has been thus defined: "When, upon *any* moral question, two different opinions are entertained by any celebrated casuists, of which opinions the one is more probable and in conformity with the law—the other *less probable*, but *more agreeable to our desires*, we may lawfully put the latter in practice." In other words, any one may transgress God's law with safety who has a probable reason for transgressing; that is, any plausible argument or authority in favour of the sin he is inclined to commit.

Methinks I now hear some one whisper, that this surely must be a mistake, if not an intentional misrepresentation of the Jesuit doctrine. Well, then, let us summon our witnesses. Our first question is, What do you mean by a *probable reason or opinion*? Hear the response of the Jesuit Filliucius. "The authority," says he, "of *one* good and learned doctor renders an opinion probable." Is this not enough? Then hear the Jesuit George De Rhodes. "It is sufficient," says he, "to render an opinion probable, that some pious doctor of great celebrity, especially among the moderns (*i. e.*, among the Jesuits) maintain it. That any opinion may become probable, a single good reason is sufficient; but the authority of *any one doctor*, of great reputation and piety, is a *good reason*"—"a *sufficient reason on which to ground the probability of any opinion.*" Such being the Jesuit definition of a probable doctrine or opinion, our next question is, How is the doctrine to be practically applied? We answer, in this way: If, for example, in favour of any sin or crime which you wish to commit, you can adduce the opinion of any one Jesuit doctor (and in doing so you can never be at any loss), be the sin or crime that of "theft or lying, perjury or impurity, homicide or parricide, or regicide, or anything else, and if your own *inclination* is in favour of that opinion which allows it, even though your judgment might assure you that that opinion is founded on much less moral probability than its opposite, then perpetrate it you may with impunity!"

Methinks I hear some one again whisper: Ah! surely this is more than a misrepresentation—it must be utterly libellous. Then, let us summon our witnesses. Hear the Jesuit Henrique. "A scrupulous man," says he, "continues safe, *if he prefers, against his scruples*, that which he considers probable, *although he may think that another opinion is more probable.*" Is there any ambiguity here? If so, then let the Jesuit Paul Laymann remove it. "Of two contradictory probable opinions," says he, "touching the legality or illegality of any human action, *every one may follow, in practice or in action, that which he should prefer*; although it may appear to the agent himself *less pro-*

*bable in theory.*" Yea more, adds he, "A learned person may give *contrary advice to different persons, according to contrary probable opinions*; whilst he still preserves discretion and prudence."

This, however, it may be alleged, is mere dogmatic assertion. Very well, then listen to the Jesuit Casnedi's *demonstration* on the subject. "We are never," says he, "more free from the violation of the law, than when we *persuade ourselves* that we are not bound by the law; for he who says that he is bound by the law, rather exposes himself to danger of committing sin. *Perhaps* he who has thus persuaded himself will not fall into sin; *but he who says that the law is not binding* CANNOT SIN. *He, therefore* (mark the conclusion), *who follows the less rigid and less probable opinion cannot sin.*"

Can there be any mind so hopelessly obtuse as to have one lingering particle of dubiety now? If so, then must the force of a few transpicuous *examples* effectually dislodge it. Ye Socialists and Radicals, and politically disaffected! here is a convenient example for you. "If," says the Jesuit Louis de Scildere, "if a subject *thinks probably that a tax has been unjustly imposed, he is not bound to pay it.*" Ye covetous and extortioners! here is a charming example for you. "I think it *probable*," says the Jesuit Ferdinand de Castro Palao, "that the cloak which I possess is my own; yet I think it more *probable* that it belongs to you." In such a case, "*I am not bound to give it up to you, but I may safely retain it.*" "In other words, though the cloak is yours, since I *prefer* to keep it, I may do so without sin! Ye partial and unjust judges! here is an example, with ample license for you. "Without respect of persons, may a judge," asks the Jesuit Gregory of Valencia, "in order to favour his friend, decide according to *any probable opinion*, while the question of right remains undecided?" And what is his reply? It is this: "If the judge should *think* each opinion equally probable, for the sake of his friend, he may *lawfully* pronounce sentence according to the opinion which is more favourable to the interest of that friend. He may, moreover, with the intent to serve his friend, at one time judge according to one opinion, and at another time according to the contrary opinion, provided only that no scandal result from the opinion."

Ah! how different, how contrary all this to the dictates of right reason—to the perfect ethics of God's Word! Is the soul poised between two opposing probabilities, but is one soon found to be a probability of the highest, and the other a probability of the lowest degree? What, then, says reason itself? Is it not, that the highest probability should instantly determine the course of obedience? No, replies the Jesuit; *desire, or preference, or self-interest*, may at once make the scale preponderate in favour of the very lowest probability! Thus is reason itself contradicted and scandalized! And how much more the Word of God! For, what saith it, even in matters of indifference; that is, in respect to actions which are neither expressly prohibited nor expressly enjoined? Are we in doubt, in suspense, or in any uncertainty even here?—then to *refrain* is our imperative duty. "He that doubteth is damned if he eat;" and, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin."

The second of these general principles, which alone are enough to upset the basis of all morality, is the doctrine of *philosophical sin*;

of a single individual (the general) can cause the whole Society to turn and return, and determine the revolution of this numerous body, which is easily moved, but with difficulty shaken."

But we must now proceed to the actual proof of our charge, viz., that the Jesuit morality does violate, yea, and systematically teaches how to violate with impunity, every precept of the decalogue. And, *first*, there are *certain general principles adopted and enforced by the Jesuits, which alone are sufficient to sap the foundations of all morality.*

The first of these which I shall notice is the celebrated *doctrine of probability*. The doctrine has been thus defined: "When, upon *any* moral question, two different opinions are entertained by any celebrated casuists, of which opinions the one is more probable and in conformity with the law—the other *less probable*, but *more agreeable to our desires*, we may lawfully put the latter in practice." In other words, any one may transgress God's law with safety who has a probable reason for transgressing; that is, any plausible argument or authority in favour of the sin he is inclined to commit.

Methinks I now hear some one whisper, that this surely must be a mistake, if not an intentional misrepresentation of the Jesuit doctrine. Well, then, let us summon our witnesses. Our first question is, What do you mean by a *probable reason or opinion*? Hear the response of the Jesuit Filliucius. "The authority," says he, "of *one* good and learned doctor renders an opinion probable." Is this not enough? Then hear the Jesuit George De Rhodes. "It is sufficient," says he, "to render an opinion probable, that some pious doctor of great celebrity, especially among the moderns (*i. e.*, among the Jesuits) maintain it. That any opinion may become probable, a single good reason is sufficient; but the authority of *any one doctor*, of great reputation and piety, is a *good reason*"—"a sufficient reason on which to ground the probability of any opinion." Such being the Jesuit definition of a probable doctrine or opinion, our next question is, How is the doctrine to be practically applied? We answer, in this way: If, for example, in favour of any sin or crime which you wish to commit, you can adduce the opinion of any one Jesuit doctor (and in doing so you can never be at any loss), be the sin or crime that of "theft or lying, perjury or impurity, homicide or parricide, or regicide, or anything else, and if your own *inclination* is in favour of that opinion which allows it, even though your judgment might assure you that that opinion is founded on much less moral probability than its opposite, then perpetrate it you may with impunity!"

Methinks I hear some one again whisper: Ah! surely this is more than a misrepresentation—it must be utterly libellous. Then, let us summon our witnesses. Hear the Jesuit Henrique. "A scrupulous man," says he, "continues safe, *if he prefers, against his scruples*, that which he considers probable, *although he may think that another opinion is more probable.*" Is there any ambiguity here? If so, then let the Jesuit Paul Laymann remove it. "Of two contradictory probable opinions," says he, "touching the legality or illegality of any human action, *every one may follow, in practice or in action, that which he should prefer*; although it may appear to the agent himself *less pro-*

*bable in theory.*" Yea more, adds he, "A learned person may give *contrary advice to different persons, according to contrary probable opinions*; whilst he still preserves discretion and prudence."

This, however, it may be alleged, is mere dogmatic assertion. Very well, then listen to the Jesuit Casnedi's *demonstration* on the subject. "We are never," says he, "more free from the violation of the law, than when we *persuade ourselves* that we are *not bound by the law*; for he who says that he is bound by the law, rather exposes himself to danger of committing sin. *Perhaps* he who has thus persuaded himself will not fall into sin; *but he who says that the law is not binding* CANNOT SIN. *He, therefore* (mark the conclusion), *who follows the less rigid and less probable opinion cannot sin.*"

Can there be any mind so hopelessly obtuse as to have one lingering particle of dubiety now? If so, then must the force of a few transpicuous *examples* effectually dislodge it. Ye Socialists and Radicals, and politically disaffected! here is a convenient example for you. "If," says the Jesuit Louis de Scildere, "if a subject *thinks probably that a tax has been unjustly imposed, he is not bound to pay it.*" Ye covetous and extortioners! here is a charming example for you. "I think it *probable*," says the Jesuit Ferdinand de Castro Palao, "that the cloak which I possess is my own; yet I think it more *probable* that it belongs to you." In such a case, "*I am not bound to give it up to you, but I may safely retain it.*" "In other words, though the cloak is yours, since I *prefer* to keep it, I may do so without sin! Ye partial and unjust judges! here is an example, with ample license for you. "Without respect of persons, may a judge," asks the Jesuit Gregory of Valencia, "in order to favour his friend, decide according to *any probable opinion*, while the question of right remains undecided?" And what is his reply? It is this: "If the judge should *think* each opinion equally probable, for the sake of his friend, he may *lawfully* pronounce sentence according to the opinion which is more favourable to the interest of that friend. He may, moreover, with the intent to serve his friend, at one time judge according to one opinion, and at another time according to the contrary opinion, provided only that no scandal result from the opinion."

Ah! how different, how contrary all this to the dictates of right reason—to the perfect ethics of God's Word! Is the soul poised between two opposing probabilities, but is one soon found to be a probability of the highest, and the other a probability of the lowest degree? What, then, says reason itself? Is it not, that the highest probability should instantly determine the course of obedience? No, replies the Jesuit; *desire, or preference, or self-interest*, may at once make the scale preponderate in favour of the very lowest probability! Thus is reason itself contradicted and scandalized! And how much more the Word of God! For, what saith it, even in matters of indifference; that is, in respect to actions which are neither expressly prohibited nor expressly enjoined? Are we in doubt, in suspense, or in any uncertainty even here?—then to *refrain* is our imperative duty. "He that doubteth is damned if he eat;" and, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin."

The second of these general principles, which alone are enough to upset the basis of all morality, is the doctrine of *philosophical sin*;

obligation, the old covenant bondage, the Mosaico-Jewish slavery of loving God, his and our Father, and of serving him with love! Is any tender conscience shocked at the bold averment? Then hear the solution offered by Father Suarez. "A person," says he, "is obliged to it (the love of God) at a *certain time*." But at what time he does not know; and, adds Father Sirmond: "What this doctor does not know, I can't tell who does." Father Lesseau, however, so far helps to clear up the difficult problem, by condescendingly informing us, in the negative form, when God is *not* to be loved: "A person is not obliged," says he, "to love God, neither upon saints' day, nor in the hour of death, nor when a person has received any special favour from God, nor when he goes to the sacrament of baptism, nor when he is obliged to perform any act of contrition, nor when he is arrived at the years of discretion, nor when he is under a sentence of martyrdom; because at that time attrition is sufficient."

In other words, at no period of this world's duration, at no stage of human life from the cradle to the grave, is God—the God of love, whose very name and nature is love—to be loved by his ransomed and redeemed creatures at all! Hence, the inference is inevitable, that, if he is ever to be loved at all, or in any degree, it must be somewhere in the invisible world of spirits, or at some period during the future lapse of eternal ages!

Having thus shown how effectually the *first* and *great* command, which compendiously wraps up in itself all the other precepts of the first table of the law, is evaded, violated, and evacuated of all meaning by the Jesuits, we are spared the necessity of entering into further details; though, if time permitted, it would be easy to prove the same thing of all of them separately and in succession.

We, therefore, pass on to the *second* table. It too, is summarily wrapped up in the one other command, which is like unto the first, viz., "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." And, if the first was made void, need we wonder that the second should be made void too?

In the beginning, God said: "Ye shall not eat of this tree; for if ye do, ye shall surely die." The subtle tempter dared to contradict his Maker, saying: "Ye may eat of the fruit of the tree; and if ye do, ye shall *not* surely die." So here, the great Teacher, Jehovah-Jesus, said: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and soul, and strength, and mind." The subtle doctors of Jesuitism presume to contradict him, saying: "Do not love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and soul, and strength, and mind; it is not necessary that you should love him at all; it is quite enough that you do not positively hate him."

So, again, with respect to the second command, which is like unto the first, Jehovah-Jesus said: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself;" and again: "A new commandment give I to you, That ye love one another." Also the inspired Apostle Paul: "He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law;" and the inspired Apostle John: "He that hath not love, abideth in death."

But what says Father Tambourin? "I think it," says he, "altogether certain that there is no obligation to love him (*i.e.*, your neighbour), by any internal act or motion expressly tending towards him."



Upon which Father Lamy steps in with an argument, at once subtle and cunning. "We are not obliged," says he, "by virtue of this command, to love our neighbour otherwise or better than ourselves. Now we are not bound to love ourselves with an internal action of love; therefore we are not under the obligation of such love to our neighbour." Nay, more, shouts Father Bauni: "We may (not only not love, but may) wish harm to our neighbour without sin, when we are pushed upon it by some good motives."

Do you wish next, to know what may those "good motives" be which, in the estimation of a Jesuit, may completely justify you not only in not loving, but in positively hating, ay, and wishing harm to your neighbour? Here is an express example furnished by Bonacina. "A mother," says he, "is guiltless who *wishes* the *death* of her *daughters*, when, by reason of their deformity or poverty, she cannot marry them to her heart's desire." Here is a principle, which if carried out, would soon reduce men to a condition beneath that of the wild beasts. "Whoever," asks the Roman Satirist, "saw lions or wild boars kill and worry one another to pieces? The very tigers, as ravenous as they are, maintain an inviolable peace with their own kind, and so do the bears." But, if it be lawful—from motives of base, selfish, grovelling, temporal interest—for mothers to desire the death of their own daughters, *à fortiori*, how much more lawful must it be to desire the death of other human beings, when we may thereby be gainers? And how can the lawfulness of such barbarous desire be compatible with the love of our neighbour?

From the general principle of the love of our neighbour, we may now take a rapid glance at some of the particulars.

The second table of the law begins with the *honouring of parents*, including all the duties of respect, reverence, filial gratitude, and needful support.

But what says Father Fagundez? According to him, there are circumstances in which children may not only not honour their parents, but may even justifiably act the part of parricides towards them. "It is lawful," says he, "for a son to rejoice at the murder of his parent (and, as if that were not enough, mark what was added), *committed by himself*, in a state of drunkenness, on account of the great riches thence acquired by inheritance." "This doctrine of Father Fagundez," adds Gobat, "which *may* seem a paradox, is *true in theory*, although it *may be* dangerous in practice."

Again: "Christian and Catholic sons may accuse their fathers of the crime of heresy, if they wish to turn them from the earth, although they know that their parents may be burned with fire, and put to death for it." "And not only may they refuse them food, if they attempt to turn them from the Catholic faith, but they may also justly kill them." Yea, even when the father is a sound and consistent Papist, Tambourin teaches how a son may not only be exempted from the duty of honouring him, but may even be excused for desiring his death! "If," says he, "you desire the death of your father, with a proviso, the answer is plain that you may do it lawfully." Now, what sort of proviso does he mean? Here is his own explanation. The son has only to say to himself: "I desire the death of my father, not as

an evil to him, but as a good, or cause of good to myself, viz., because by such, his death, I shall succeed to his estate;" only let a son be enabled to hold this language, and he may then honestly and lawfully wish for his father's death!

Is *stealing* expressly forbidden by the divine law?—were the words, "Thou shalt not steal," thundered from the heights of Sinai? Here, however, is an ample indulgence, at least for small thefts or petty larcenies, with the privilege of repeating them a number of times without being obliged to make restitution. "Exhort servants," says the apostle, "to be obedient unto their masters, not purloining, but showing all good fidelity." "Servants," says Valerius Reginald, "are excused both from sin and restitution, if they only take (from their masters' property) in *equitable* compensation." "It is not a mortal sin," says Emmanuel Sa, "*to take secretly* from him who would give if he were asked, *although he may be unwilling that it should be taken secretly: and it is not necessary to restore.* It is *not theft* to take a *small* thing secretly from a husband or a father; but if it be *considerable*, it must be restored. He who, from any urgent necessity, or without causing much loss, takes wood from another man's pile, is *not obliged to restore it.* He who has stolen *small* things from any one at different times, is obliged to make restitution, *when* they amount to a *considerable* sum, although some persons deny it (*i. e.*, the obligation to make restitution) with probability."

And now, ye merchants, here is a license for you—a full and free license to be dishonest and fraudulent in your commercial transactions. The apostle, it is true, exhorted, saying: "This is the will of God, that no man go beyond or defraud his brother in any matter; because that the Lord is the avenger of all such." "A man," on the other hand, says Father Tolet, supposing a special case, "a man, for instance, cannot sell his wine at a *fair* price, either on account of the injustice of the judge, or through fraud of the purchasers, who have agreed among themselves to be few in number to lower the price:—then (mark what follows), then he *may diminish his measure, or mix a little water with his wine, and sell it for pure wine of full measure, demanding the full price*, provided only that he does not tell a lie (as if the lying action did not speak louder than would the lying word); which, if he does, it will neither be a dangerous nor a mortal sin, neither will it oblige him to make restitution."

But, lest any dishonest person might be disconcerted by the *apparent* proviso against "telling a lie," the same author elsewhere hastens to his relief; and labours to show him and all others, how, in utter defiance of the *ninth* commandment, they may all *forswear*, or *perjure* themselves with the utmost impunity. The case of an accused person is supposed, and the question is started, whether, when he is pressed, he may reply, "I have not done it"—or, that he "had no accomplices" although he had? The reply is in the affirmative—that he *may*; only he must be careful to make his denial with a mental reservation—"as if," says the Jesuit father, "he intended to say, 'I have not done it'—meaning (in his own mind) 'since he had been in prison;' and, 'I have had no accomplices'—understanding (in his own mind) 'in other crimes,' or some such meaning."

The same *résumé* for equivocation and lying is thus given by another Jesuit, Filliucius, one of their most famous doctors, and the Pope's penitentiary. A person is supposed to be accused of having ate something forbidden. "With what precaution," asks the father, "is equivocation to be used in such a case?—When we begin, for instance, to say, 'I swear,' we must insert, *in a subdued tone*, the mental restriction, '*that to-day*,' and then continue *aloud*, 'I have not eaten such a thing.'"

Let us apply this *résumé* to another and a precisely parallel case. On crossing the plain, I see a ruffian soldier knock down a gentleman and rob him of his watch and money. I am summoned to give evidence at the criminal sessions. When asked if I saw the prisoner commit the deed, I may, according to the Jesuit father, answer *aloud*, in the hearing of the whole court, "*O no, I did not see him*"—provided that mentally, or in a subdued tone, heard by no one, I say to myself, "leap into the river," or "fly over the monument," or "seize the Emperor of China," or "grasp the pole-star with his right hand."

If such a principle were once introduced amongst us, would it not at once put an end to all fair dealings—to all justice—to all confidence between man and man? for, who could ever know or conjecture what was passing in the mind of another, or whether his real meaning was not exactly the opposite of what his words appeared to indicate? The same Jesuit author (Filliucius) thus proceeds still more systematically to teach the art of deceiving men by false promises—the art of swearing a thing to be black when we know it is white, and yet our promise be still reckoned sincere and our oath sacred. "The man," says he, "who has *externally* promised anything (suppose a sum of money), but *without an intention of promising*; that same person being asked whether he made such a promise, may *deny* it; *meaning to himself that he did not make a promise that was binding*. Nay, he may go much further; for, he may even swear to it." Tambourin goes beyond this latitude, and excuses even those from keeping their word and oath who *afterwards* make a *doubt* whether they intended to oblige themselves to keep such word or such oath. "Though you are sure," says he, "that you have made a vow or an oath, it is probable, in my opinion, that you are not bound by it, if *you doubt whether you had an intention to oblige yourself to stand to it*." Not satisfied with this extension of the license, Valentia bravely declares, "that even though one made a promise with an intention of being obliged to it, the obligation does not take place, *provided there was no design to perform the thing promised*; BECAUSE the vow becomes null and void if you have no will to put it in execution." As if all this were not enough, Sanchez must come forward with statements still more amplified and explicit. "If," says he, "a man should swear that he has not done a thing which in reality he has, *meaning some other thing within his own breast which he has not done, or some other day than that given for the thing done—suppose it be before he was born, or any such true circumstance—he is neither perjured nor a liar*. And this is very convenient to hide many things. But the just cause of making such ambiguities is, as often as it may be necessary or useful for the defence of one's person, honour, or estate. So a man may lawfully say he did

not kill *Peter*; meaning privately another man of that name, or that he did not do it before he was born." And last of all, in order to banish any scruples that might still keep lingering about the threshold of weak or tender consciences, the same author boldly propounds the notable art of "swearing by a *double entendre*"—of swearing and not swearing in the same breath—of swearing falsely without being perjured. The secret is a curious one, but very simple; for the whole mystery consists in cutting off the initial consonant of a single word. "When," says he, "one goes to swear, or when one is pressed to take an oath, say, *Uro*, which signifies, *I burn*, instead of *Juro*, *I swear*; which, whether you burn or not, would be but a venial lie at most." Is it a breach of well-principled charity to conclude that, surely the force of shameless impudence can no farther go?—but it seems that it may go even farther still.

Is not *murder* one of the most fearful of crimes, alike forbidden by the laws of God and man? We have already seen the unnatural license allowed in the case of children towards their parents; we have now to show that the license has been so widely extended as to embrace almost all imaginable relationships. "It is lawful," says Fagundez, "for us to kill a man, when, if we kill him not, another will kill us." Which aphorism is thus illustrated by Valerius Reginald: "If you are preparing to give false evidence against me, by which I should receive sentence of death, and I have no other means of escape, it is lawful for me to kill you, since I should otherwise be killed myself; for it would be immaterial in such a case, whether you killed me with your own or another man's sword; as, for instance, by that of the executioner."

Again, says Fagundez: "If a judge had been unjust (and what real criminal is ever willing to confess that he is just?) and had proceeded (in trial) without adhering to the course of the law, then certainly might the accused defend himself by *assaulting* and *even killing the judge*." "It will be lawful for an ecclesiastic," says Francis Amicus, "or one of a religious order, to kill a calumniator." "The calumniator," adds Airult, somewhat softening the harshness of this abrupt judgment, "should *first be warned* that he desist from the slander; and if he will not, he should be killed, not openly, on account of the scandal, but secretly." What is this, in plain language, but an unlimited license for assassination?

The lawfulness, yea, the meritoriousness of murdering heretic (*i.e.*, Protestant or non-Romish) princes, or even Romish princes, not sufficiently favourable to Romish interests, is inculcated in every imaginable form. Of a prince of this description John Mariana says: "I shall never consider that man to have done wrong, who, favouring the public wishes, would attempt to kill him." Again: "To put them (*i.e.*, such princes) to death, is not only lawful, but a laudable and glorious action." Once more: "It is a glorious thing to exterminate this pestilent and mischievous race from the community of men." "These," says James Keller, "may certainly be put to death by any one who has the courage and inclination to kill them." "Among many other things," says Francis Suarez, "comprised in these words (*viz.*, Feed my sheep), and in the power which they convey, this also is included,

destroy, proscribe, depose, heretic kings, who will not be corrected, and who are injurious to their subjects in things which concern the Catholic faith." "It is a question," says James Gretser, still more broadly, "in the schools, whether it is lawful to kill an innocent person?" To which he replies: "That the Jesuits, in this question, incline to the affirmative rather than to the negative, their writings sufficiently show."

Hitherto I have been enabled to proceed with separate quotations to show how every commandment of the decalogue may be violated with impunity. But there is one, as to which I must beg to be excused for not entering on it at all. It is the *seventh*. How to violate it in its letter and spirit—in thought, word, and deed—in every imaginable, and, apart from Jesuit imaginations, every unimaginable form—is pointed out, in their writings with a minuteness, a loathsomeness, and a pruriency, compared with which the most filthy passages in the grossest of the heathen poets and satirists bear the stamp and impress of relative refinement. It is, in fact, a bottomless abyss of obscenities, nudities, criminal liberties, and defiling turpitudes—an abyss, from which I most gladly hasten away, as from one whose very brink is thickly fringed all around with pollution.

At the outset you were constituted into a jury. You have heard the charge preferred against the morality of the Jesuits. You have now listened to a portion of the evidence, drawn forth, if not from the lips, at least from the pens of Jesuit witnesses. What say ye, then? Has the charge been substantiated, or not? And is your verdict, that of "Proven," or "Not proven?" Substantiated beyond all debate—proven, beyond the possibility of question, must surely be the prompt and simultaneous response of every candid mind.

But lest, as a Protestant jury, ye may be accused of partiality, let me summon into your presence a jury of other men—men, not Protestants at all, but rigid and consistent Romanists—men, therefore, "who," as has been justly remarked, "could have no hatred of the Jesuits for being the allies of Rome, seeing that they themselves were rigid Romanists—men, who could have no motive in bearing false witness against the Jesuits, seeing that they could earn nothing by it; but, on the contrary, jeopardied their property, and perilled their life and liberty—men, whose testimony we may consider as the reluctant but unavoidable evidence of individuals tempted by every consideration to judge most leniently, and describe most favourably, the character of the order brought to trial."

From an immense multitude we single out the following:—

In 1642, we find a work by the Jesuit Bauni, who had been professor of moral theology at the Jesuit college, denounced "as calculated to encourage licentiousness and the corruption of manners; as violating natural equity, and the rights of man, and tolerating blasphemy, usury, simony, and many other enormous crimes, as offences of no magnitude." And by whom, think you, was this condemnatory sentence pronounced? By an assembly of Romish clergy holden at Nantes!

In 1663, the Jesuits put forth a still more important work in defence

of their moral opinions, *published by express permission of the superiors*. In 1664, its object was, in these terms, declared to be, "not merely to revive all the errors and impieties of the apology of the casuists, but to surpass them in so great a degree that it might be considered the common-sewer of all the filth and impiety of which the human mind is capable." By whom was the crushing declaration made? By Maris, a Romish divine, publicly before the University of Paris! In another censure pronounced in 1665, on the same work, it was declared that "their (the censurers') respect for decency prevented them from noticing the abominations which it contained on the subject of chastity." Who pronounced so grave and severe a sentence? The Romish Faculty of Theology in the University of Paris! In another judgment on the same work, it is averred "that it abounded in propositions fit only to pervert all Christian morals, and that the Faculty of Theology, observing homicide, theft, simony, usury, and other crimes which cannot be publicly named, expressly sanctioned by these modern casuists, had considered it their duty to oppose the spread of such destructive doctrines." Who supplied this fearful portrait? The Romish advocates of the Romish monarch Louis XIV.!

Here is another portraiture of their principles and practices: "It cannot be, but that the licentiousness introduced by the Jesuits, of which the three leading features are *falsehood, murder, and perjury*, should not give a new character to the morals of the *externi* (or all who are not of their Society), as well as to the external government of the *nostri*, or their own body. In fact, since these religious have introduced into Christian and civil society those perverted dogmas which render *murder innocent*, which *sanctify falsehood, authorize perjury, deprive the laws of their power, destroy the submission of subjects*, allow individuals the liberty of *calumniating, killing, lying, and forswearing themselves, as their advantage may dictate*—which *remove the fear of divine and human laws*, and permit a man to redress his own grievances without applying to the magistrate—it is easy to see, without much penetration, that Christian and civil society could not subsist without a miracle." Worse and worse, it will be said, by the Romanist. This must be a libel—yea, the libellous caricature of an enemy. No such thing; the author happens to be none other than his most Catholic Majesty, the Romish King of Portugal!

Our next witness, or rather batch of witnesses, will be one of the mightiest corporate bodies in Christendom. In a public memorial of this body, published in 1643, they declared themselves ready to prove, that "there is no article in religion which the Jesuits have not corrupted, and do not daily corrupt, by erroneous novelties; that the scholastic theology has been depraved by the dangerous opinions of their writers, who have had the approbation, or at least the connivance (mark this) of the whole Society; that Christian morality had become a body of problematical opinions, since their Society had undertaken, by a general understanding, to accommodate it to the luxury of the age; that the laws of God had been sophisticated by their unheard-of subtleties; that there was no longer any difference between vice and virtue; that, by a base indulgence, they promised impunity to the most flagrant crimes; that there was no conscience, however erroneous, which

might not obtain peace, if it would confide in them; and that, in short, their doctrines, inimical to all order, had equally resisted the power of kings and the authority of the hierarchy." Nor is this all. With increasing emphasis they thus proceed: "If the light which God has placed in all reasonable minds, in order to show the distinction between purity and iniquity, were so far extinguished that such a pernicious theology could be universally received—in that case, deserts and forests would be preferable to cities; and society with wild beasts, who have only their natural arms, would be better than with men who, in addition to the violence of their passions, would be instructed (mark the terrible energy of the expression) instructed by this *doctrine of devils* to dissimulate and feign, and to counterfeit the characters of intimate friends, in order to destroy others with the greater impunity." And, as if this were not enough, still a little farther on they reiterate the fearful sentence, saying: "*It is the device of the great enemy of souls and the spirit of the world.*" And what body is it that has left on record so terrible a verdict against the morality of the Jesuits? An intemperate assembly of hot-headed Protestants? No; but the intensely Romish University of Paris!

Or, if there be, apart from Rome itself, another witness, or band of witnesses, more competent still, it is surely to be found in the highest tribunal of Popish France. Here, then, is its decision, recorded upwards of a century later—in 1762: "The Court has ordained that the passages extracted from the books of one hundred and forty-seven Jesuit authors having been verified, a collated copy shall be presented to his majesty, that he may be made acquainted with the wickedness of the doctrine constantly held by the Jesuits, from the institution of their Society to the present moment, together with the approbation of their theologians, the permission of superiors and generals, and the praise of other members of the said Society—a doctrine (mark the clearness and strength of the language) a doctrine authorizing robbery, lying, perjury, impurity—all passions and all crimes; inculcating homicide, parricide, and regicide; overturning religion, in order to substitute in her stead superstition; and thereby sanctioning magic, blasphemy, irreligion, and idolatry. And his majesty shall be most humbly entreated to consider what results from instruction so pernicious." Can any decision be "more grave, more formal, or in evidence more authentic" than this? And yet it is the unbiassed judgment of the highest judicial assembly in France. It is the Parliament of Paris that has thus boldly arraigned, and thus sweepingly condemned, the morality of the Jesuits!

What, then, shall we say of a system, against which so fearful a charge has been established out of the writings of Jesuit authors themselves, yea, and admitted to have been established by the highest and most competent Romish authorities?—a system which, as has been demonstrated, makes void and practically nullifies every commandment of the decalogue, every precept of Christianity? How shall we designate it? Is not this pre-eminently the "deceivableness of unrighteousness?" Is not this pre-eminently *the Antichrist*, the Son of Perdition? Where, if not here, shall we find the "Lawless One" who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped? Where, if not here, shall we discover the "Man of Sin," who "speaks

lies in hypocrisy, having his conscience seared with a hot iron?" Where, if not here, shall we ever be able to detect "the Mystery of Iniquity?" Or, if it be lawful, not in mere wantonness and illiberality, but in deepest humiliation and sorrow, to coin a new term—a harsh and forbidding one, we admit, yet a term briefly descriptive of a fearful substantive reality—might we not say in truth, as well as in charity, for charity ever rejoiceth in the truth, that the system, as already more than suggested by the Romish University of Paris, is one of pure and undiluted "*devilism*?" For what is the most characteristic function, the most distinguishing attribute and vocation of the prince of darkness? Is it not to despise, condemn, and practically abrogate every commandment of the eternal God? Is it not to strive, with might and main, to teach, tempt, or instigate all others to do so too? And is not this the very function, attribute, and vocation which has been (successfully, we doubt not) charged home upon the Jesuits and their execrable morality? And if so, why should we scruple or hesitate, rather why should we not boldly and fearlessly, honestly and truthfully, learn to nominate and distinguish things by their proper names? Or, if there be aught more fiendish or satanic in the proceeding still, is it not this—that the author of all ill should, in utter contempt of heaven's Majesty, or rather, in the rampant insolence of derision, seize on heaven's laws, and pervert them into the instruments of their own infraction—seize on the very ordinances and statutes which the eternal King had ordained for the harmony of the moral universe, and turn them into the organs of a flagitious confusion of all moral distinctions—seize on the very principles and elements which a gracious Father had designed for life to his children, and transmute them into a terrible enginery of death? Has not this been actually and emphatically the highest triumph of the grand adversary of God and man? And has it not, in a way proportionable to their ability, been the fatal triumph of the Jesuits too? Again, then, we ask, in downright earnestness we ask, why shrink in craven cowardice from calling things by their proper names?

For the sake of illustration and variety, let us remind you of one of the most striking conceptions, in that most striking and wonderful of all heroic songs—the "*Paradise Lost*." The arch-enemy is supposed to have reached the seat of primeval innocence. It was indeed a blissful bower, compared with which the "*sweet grove of Daphne*," with its "*inspired Castalian spring*," or the "*spicy shore of Araby the blest*" breathing "*Sabeau odours*," is not worthy of being named. But, blissful though it was, there the arch-fellon "*saw, undelighted, all delight*." Animated by one master-spirit—even that of malice and desperate revenge—and bent on one exclusive object—even that of ruining man and dishonouring God—what to him were all the beauties and the glorious of "*delicious Paradise*?"—its gentle gales, which,

"Fanning their oderiferous wings, dispensed  
Native perfumes, and whisper'd whence they stole  
Those balmy spoils;—  
Its trees of noblest kind,  
———— blooming ambrosial fruit  
Of vegetable gold;—



Its sapphire founts, with crisped brooks, that,  
Rolling on orient pearl and sands of gold,  
Ran nectar."

These, these, and all the wilderness of sweets so thickly strewn around, for him had no charms. Passing them by, with lofty disdain, he pounces at once on the tree of life—"the middle tree and highest there that grew." On it he sat—"sat like a cormorant." But, for what end sat he there? To regain therefrom true life for himself, and the means of dispensing it to others?—Oh, no! But there he sat—sat actually

—————"devising death  
To them that lived; nor on the virtue thought  
Of that life-giving plant, but only us'd  
For prospect what, well-us'd, had been the pledge  
Of immortality."

Now, is not this the very picture and counterpart of the proceedings of "the Society of Jesus?" Is not revelation a radiant bower? Of the whole of its contents may we not truly predicate what has been so nobly expressed of a part?—"Indited, as they undoubtedly were," says the saintly Horne, "under the influence of Him to whom all hearts are known, and all secrets foreknown, they suit mankind in all situations, grateful as the manna which descended from above, and which conformed itself to every palate. The fairest productions of human art, after a few perusals, like gathered flowers, wither in our hands, and lose their fragrantcy; but these unfading plants of paradise become, as we are accustomed to them, still more and more beautiful; their bloom appears to be daily heightened, fresh odours are emitted, and new sweets are extracted from them. He who hath once tasted their excellences, will desire to taste them yet again; and he who tastes them oftenest will relish them best." Into this radiant bower of revelation have not the members of "the Company of Jesus" entered?

"Practising falsehood under saintly show,  
Deep malice to conceal, couched with revenge."

Wholly absorbed with one idea, and intensely devoted to the prosecution of a single object—the restoration of the Papal supremacy and the aggrandizement of their own order—what to them were all the beauties and the glories of revealed truth? Nought—nought whatsoever. There they could see, "undelighted, all delight." Passing by the ordinary garniture of trees, and branches, and flowers, they pounce at once on the tree of life, the leaves of which are for the healing of the nations. In other words, they seize on the gospel of grace and salvation, the doctrines and the precepts of which are designed as a remedy for the disease of sin throughout all the kindreds and families of the earth. But, instead of drawing therefrom life to themselves, and the means of dispensing it to others, they sit down—I almost shudder when I think of it—they sit down, with the Gospel in their hands, deliberately devising death to those who otherwise might have lived. With consummate coolness and self-possession, ay, and with imperturbably calm and self-satisfied peace of mind, they sit down; and by their specious machinery of sophistries, and subtleties, and hair-splitting distinctions, and straining at gnats and swallowing of camels, they contrive to trans-

mute every virtue of that life-giving plant, every doctrine and precept of the blessed Gospel, which, well used, had been the pledge of immortality, into a deadly poison, not for the healing, but for the ministering of spiritual and eternal death to the nations! Who, then, will presume to reply in the negative, when I ask—not in the way of idle, senseless declamation, but in strictest consistency with demonstrated truth, and rigid impartial justice—whether all this, in its intention, progress, and consummation, be not literally and truly the very masterpiece of hell—the very perfection of devilism?

*The Practices of the Jesuits.*

Having thus briefly unfolded the moral principles of the Jesuits, we must next, though with equal brevity, direct attention to their practices. For past experience amply proves that they could well practise what they so assiduously preached, and that, whenever opportunities occurred, they never scrupled to put their doctrines into execution. Now, from a fountain so foul and so polluted, what could we expect to flow but impure and muddy streams? From principles so dangerous, nay, so utterly opposed to the express commands of Scripture, and the peace and safety of society at large, what could we expect but deeds of the darkest shadow, and crimes of the blackest dye? Accordingly, as has been remarked, “a faithful record of the transactions of which our globe has been the theatre, would, we think, bear out the assertion fully, that there is no chapter in the world’s history stained with so foul a blot, or filled with such extensive elements of mourning, and lamentation, and woe, as the chapter which would contain a complete and unvarnished rehearsal of ‘*The acts of the Jesuits.*’”

The subject, however, is so immense, that we can scarcely do more than approach its threshold. If time permitted, we could easily show that, as there is not a command in the decalogue which they have not taught *how* to violate with impunity, so there is not a commandment in the decalogue which they have not actually violated in their own practices. But time will not permit; and, therefore, we must rest satisfied with a few classified generalizations, that may simply serve to indicate the course which we were prepared fully to traverse and amply to illustrate.

And, *first*, Let us view the sinister practices of the Jesuits in reference to *education and the spread of true knowledge*.

If crookedness, perverseness, or hostility be discovered here, then must the celebrated aphorism of our great English moralist come into full play, viz., “He that voluntarily continues in ignorance is guilty of all the crimes which ignorance produces; as to him that should extinguish the tapers of a light-house might justly be imputed the calamities of shipwreck.”

What, then, in reference to this all-important subject, are the facts of the case, as engraven on the pages of authentic history?

The mind of Europe, let it be remembered, had been liberated by the reforming impulse. Freely and fearlessly did it then shoot out, with accelerated force, in all directions.\* Freely and fearlessly was

\* This, with a few other passages in the Lecture, has been taken from an ephemeral

every department of mind and matter sifted and explored. Freely and fearlessly were the rights of conscience, the range and limitations of civil and religious liberty, the relations of man to man, and of all men to their God, investigated and settled. Independence of inquiry, freedom of thought, manliness of sentiment, and energy of expression, increased and abounded; while, as the necessary result, knowledge, true knowledge, in every domain of improved literature, newly created science, and restored theology, increased and abounded too. What, then, must be done by the chosen emissaries of Rome? Openly to denounce or anathematize such knowledge in the gross, was no longer deemed expedient or safe. What, then, must be done? What, but change entirely the old course of tactics, relinquish hostilities, proclaim a truce, embrace the ancient foe, and so manage the embrace as to stifle and smother its object? Behold, then, the new and wondrous career, the consummately dexterous undertaking, of the "Society of Jesus!" Keenly alive to the importance of *education*, they go forth, and so master every branch of learning as to acquire a renown that eclipses every other. Of that renown they take skilful advantage. Those branches of knowledge which tended most to elevate and strengthen the mind, to exercise and brace the reasoning faculty, to render inquiry free, penetrating, and bold, they gradually suppressed, or mutilated, or bent to unworthy ends. Those branches of knowledge, on the other hand, which tended to withdraw the mind from the all-important themes of theology and ethics, civil and religious liberty—which tended merely to regale the senses, to gratify the taste, to polish the manners, to amuse the fancy, to occupy the imaginative faculties, and lead to inventions for augmenting the comforts and conveniences of man's *temporal* estate—these, these they cultivated to the uttermost. Around these they strove to shed a halo of glory which might out-dazzle all the rest. On these they contrived to lavish all their hosannas of applause; and thus laboured to attract towards them the generous aspirings of youth, and concentrate on them the expanding energies of riper years. This view of their marvellous crusade has been briefly but admirably depicted by the celebrated French essayist on the Reformation. "To model Science," says he, "according to the interests of the pontifical power, and render even science ignorant in all things in which it was requisite that she should be ignorant; to produce some things in the clearest light, and to retain others in the thickest darkness; to fertilize the kingdoms of memory and the imagination, by rendering that of thought and reason barren; to form minds submissive without being ignorant of any thing but what could affect their submission, like those highly valued slaves of the great men of antiquity, who were grammarians, rhetoricians, poets, fine dancers, and musicians, and knew everything except to become free; to make reason and knowledge themselves operate to the consolidation of a system hostile to reason and knowledge; I cannot fear that I shall be contradicted by any impartial man, in stating that such was the system of instruction adopted by the Jesuits. It was ingenious, and universally adapted to

address delivered a few years ago by the author in the Town Hall of Calcutta. To prevent any misconception, the fact is here simply stated, without its being deemed necessary to make any further acknowledgment.

the end they had in view. It was calculated to form illustrious and elegant authors, learned men, orators, good Roman Catholics, Jesuits, if you please, but *not* MEN in the full acceptation of that term. He who became a man under their management, became so independently of that management, and in spite of it." \*

When will Protestants be wise? When will they waken from their sleep, and slumber, and dreamy indifference? When will they learn to distinguish the mirage of a spurious liberalism from the living waters of a genuine Christian liberality? When will they learn to distrust the empty profession of men who, under pretences of a flaming zeal for knowledge, go forth only the more effectually to forge those fetters which shall re-enslave the souls of men in the bondage of a galling superstition and crushing despotism? When will Protestants learn to refuse *on principle*—refuse, from respect to the laws of God, from love to the souls of their children, from a regard to the best interests

\* All this perfectly accords with the observation of D'Alembert, quoted by Robertson, though neither of these authors seem to have hit on the true key of its solution, viz., "that though the Jesuits made extraordinary progress in erudition of every species—though they could reckon up many of their brethren who have been eminent mathematicians, antiquarians, and critics—though they have even formed some orators of reputation—yet the order has never produced one man whose mind was so much enlightened by sound knowledge as to merit the name of a philosopher."

All this not only accords with, but satisfactorily accounts for, the fact that, while the Jesuits could produce writers on law, and mathematics, and natural history, physicians and surgeons, dramatists, grammarians, statuary, painters, and poets, they produced no works on the "every-day literature of common life"—none on the best and highest interests of mankind—none fitted to elevate and improve the intellectual and moral character of the people at large—none calculated to make men wiser, or better, or happier, in their relations to God or to one another. To adopt and extend an expression of the author of the "Protestant:" "The writings of Milton and Locke alone, on the subject of liberty and toleration, are of more value than all that Jesuitism has produced to this day."

Or, if further proof be wanted to illustrate and confirm our view of their inveterate hostility, in practice, to the cause of *true* knowledge, we may turn to a case in which they might have done everything for it, had they been so disposed. Having succeeded in establishing an independent commonwealth in Paraguay, in South America, and having exercised an undisturbed and absolute sovereignty over that region for more than a century, it may reasonably be asked, if they were truly and honestly such flaming advocates of a *sound* and *liberal* education, How did their system operate in regard to the interests of true knowledge and the enlightenment of the people? Allowing whatever credit is due for teaching the rude natives how to cultivate the soil, build comfortable houses, &c., we aver that for the diffusion of true knowledge of any kind they did *nothing*. They erected no schools. They taught no literature—no science—no Christian theology. They kept the people at large in a state of perpetual pupillage, imbecility, and mental childhood. To prevent the intrusion of one new idea, they prohibited all egress from their own territory to the inhabitants, and all ingress to strangers. And to render the barrier to intercommunion still more impracticable, they strictly forbade the acquisition of any tongue except one of the rudest and most unpolished of the Indian dialects. The despotism over mind and body was unbroken and complete, till the day of retributive vengeance drove the despots for ever from Paraguay.

The fate of knowledge was much the same in all the other Popish States of South America. Speaking of one of these so recently as 1824, Mrs Graham says, "The very names of literature and science are here almost unknown." Of another, Mr Lindley, a traveller in 1808, gives a precisely similar account. Little more than twenty years ago printing was unknown in Buenos Ayres, and every possible obstacle thrown in the way of education. Even in Brazil, there was no printing press till the Court took up its residence there in 1806, and imported one from Europe. No Bibles or Testaments had ever been introduced; and any works which had been admitted into so dark a region, were works of congenial darkness, such as story-telling almanacs, and lives of Popish saints, and manuals of ritualistic observances. So much for the boasted proceedings of the friends and advocates of knowledge in the New World.

of society—refuse utterly to aid, or sanction, or patronize, directly or indirectly, any one of the colleges or other Jesuit institutions? Ah! if they do not learn now, and learn speedily, so to act—if they persist in setting at nought every counsel, and despising every warning and reproof—the retributive sentence may soon be issued from the tribunal of the Eternal: “Ephraim is given to idols; let him alone.” And then woe, woe be unto them that shall thus be left to reap the fruit of their own devices by a gracious and long-suffering God!

*Secondly*, Let us look at the practices of the Jesuits, in reference to their *repeated and systematic violation even of their own special and peculiar vows.*

The real question is not, Whether the objects contemplated by these vows be in themselves, abstractly considered, right or wrong, proper or improper, expedient or inexpedient? Those who take the vows solemnly profess, before God and man, to believe that they are altogether right, proper, and expedient; and the real question is, Whether, in the fulness of such avowed conscientious belief, it be consistent with the laws and principles of moral obligation, to take, and from time to time to reiterate, vows, accompanied with solemn oaths, and then deliberately to violate such vows as often as caprice, inclination, or worldly interests may suggest or require? Or, the question may be put in a still simpler form, viz., *Is it right to be guilty of habitual and systematic perjury?* When stripped of all plausible pretexts and subterfuges, and put in this naked undisguised form, which is the form of essential truth and reality, the question must be met by an indignant negative, expressive alike of disgust and abhorrence.

Now, grievous and aggravated though the charge be, it is the very charge which facts without number—facts, too, of world-wide notoriety—compel us to bring against the Jesuits. To attempt to bring proofs to substantiate the charge would be like attempting to enumerate the trees of the forest, or the sands on the sea-shore. The entire history of the order, collectively and individually, is one continued tissue of substantiating facts.

Does not every “professed” member of the institute, from the general downwards, vow to be always, and in all places, prepared for the instant execution of the Papal mandate? and yet, in practice, how repeatedly, in all parts of the world, has this peculiar vow been trampled under foot! \* Yea, in the very face of this most peculiar and stringent vow, the very “constitutions” of the body contain certain adroitly expressed clauses, which virtually “elevate the authority of the general above that of the Pope, by providing that he may over-rule, without rebelling against it; for they declare that he may order his subject-missionaries to one district rather than another, at the simple preference of his own will.”

Does not every member of the Jesuit body, in the earlier stages of his novitiate, take the vows of “chastity” and “perpetual poverty?” and are not these vows, at subsequent stated intervals, repeatedly renewed? and yet, to those who are at all acquainted with the history

\* For an instructive and memorable exemplification of this assertion, the reader is referred to an article on “The Missions of the Jesuits,” in No. III. of the *Calcutta Review*.

and proceedings of the members of the body, is it not a fact, just as notorious as that the sun is in the heavens, that the former of these vows has been broken times and ways without number; and that the latter has been not only repeatedly, but habitually, and even systematically, disregarded? Is it not one of the most indubitable of historical facts, that in spite of the vow of "perpetual poverty" the Jesuits, as a corporate body, soon became by far *the wealthiest* in the whole world? \* Is it not one of the most indubitable of historical facts, that, in additional contempt of the vow of "monastic obedience," many *individual* members of the body, did, *separately*, and *on their own account*, amass a vast deal of *personal* property? † Is it not one of the most indubitable of historical facts, that, as if in open derision of the vow of "perpetual chastity," members of the Jesuit order wrote books with the sanction of their superiors, which Romanists themselves have denounced as inexpressibly abominable? and that what they pronounced in their writings they continually exemplified in the most flagrant practices? ‡

\* Here is a case, which may be taken as a single *specimen* from among hundreds of a similar kind:—

In 1767, the Jesuits, by a decree of his "Most Catholic Majesty," were, on account of their iniquitous practices, ignominiously expelled from Spain, and the whole of their property, including "goods, chattels, and estates," confiscated. On this occasion, in the College of Barcelona alone, were found "riches to the amount of twelve millions of crowns. It consisted of several tons of gold and silver, a large quantity of gold dust, emeralds and diamonds, crowns of gold ornamented with emeralds and rubies, some bales of cocoa, and some rich merchandise from the East Indies." So much for the vow of "perpetual poverty!"

† Here is a case, taken from the *Annual Register* for the year 1759, which may serve as a *specimen*:—

"*Naples, May 29th.*—Last week the apartment of the late Father Pepe, the Jesuit, for whose pulpit and confession-box the people made great scrambling, from a notion of his great sanctity, was opened, in the presence of our cardinal archbishop, and one of the king's ministers. There were found in it 600 ounces of gold in specie; bills amounting to 56,000 ducats; 1000 pounds of wax; 10 copper vessels full of Dutch tobacco; 3 gold repeating watches; 4 snuff-boxes made of rare shells; 200 silk handkerchiefs; and a capital of 300,000 ducats. Before his death he made a present to Jesus' Church of a piece of velvet hangings, laced with gold; a large statue of the immaculate conception, of massy silver; and a fine pyramid to be erected in the front of the church." So much, again, for the vow of "perpetual poverty!"

‡ As a single illustration of what is here asserted, we may again refer to the work put forth in the year 1663, by Matthew Moya—the work which a member of the French Parliament that publicly pronounced sentence of condemnation on it, reprobated as "containing whatever the most depraved mind could have discovered in a century, and all which had before escaped the wickedness and debauchery of man." And yet this is a purely Romish testimony!

As to practices, one example also, as a *specimen*, must suffice. About the beginning of last century there were several Jesuit missionaries in China. Of these, some became notorious for their gross immoralities. In 1748, the *Romish Bishop* of Nankin, in a letter to Pope Benedict XIV., refers with grief and shame to the conduct of these men, and speaks of one of them in the following terms: "But the crime committed by Father Anthony Joseph, *the superior of the missions*, is yet more scandalous. This man has remained for these *eight* years past, continually plunged in the abominable practice of sinning with women, at the time they came to confess, and even in the place where he confessed them; after which he gave them absolution, and administered the sacrament to them! He told them that these actions need not give them any concern, since all their fathers, the bishop, and the Pope himself, observed the same practices! The debaucheries of this man. . . . And this was known to Christians and to the heathens. Some persons represented these crimes to the superiors of the Jesuits; but the commissary, whom they sent for the purpose, declared him innocent; I know not upon what pretence. For myself, being unable to resist the complaints I constantly received, I collected the necessary proofs, and found that *all with which he was charged was only too true*. And while I was considering of the best means of punishing this man, the mandarins caused him to be arrested suddenly, together with

*Thirdly*, Let us look to the practices of the Jesuits in reference to their *habitual system of compromise of principle, concealment of truth, and personal disguise*.

One of the grandest and most distinguishing features in the conduct and practices of the Jesuits, has ever been the infinite variety of disguises which they assumed—the infinite variety of fictitious names and characters under which they appeared—the infinite variety of modes in which they contrived to cloak and conceal their real designs—the infinite variety of compromises of principle which they exhibited—the infinite variety of conformities to prevailing customs and opinions to which they submitted, for the more successful accomplishment of their sinister ends.

The practical principle of Jesuitism being that of expediency, in its basest, grossest, and most licentious form, it proved everywhere fatally consistent with itself. Everywhere, chameleon-like, did it assume the hue and colour of national, local, and social peculiarities. Everywhere did it accommodate itself, with elastic spring, to established habits, manners, and customs. The promotion of its own interests “by all possible means and at all possible expenses,” continued ever and everywhere, to be its animating and guiding pole-star.

Among the learned, the Jesuits showed themselves lovers of learning—among the illiterate, they upheld the maxim that ignorance was the mother of devotion; among the free, they were advocates of liberty—among the bond, apologizers for slavery; among the upright, they feigned integrity—among the unscrupulous, they encouraged fraud; among the noble, they abused the vulgar—among the vulgar, they insulted the noble; among the abstemious, they pled for temperance—among the intemperate, they turned abstemiousness into a jest; among the pure, they could eulogize chastity as one of the chiefest of virtues—among the unchaste, they gave way to the most unbridled indulgences; among Deists, or Atheists, or Jews, they could repudiate the God of the Bible and the Saviour of Christianity; among Protestants they could appear with an ultra zeal for Protestantism; among Pagan idolaters, they could sanction the most degrading idolatry and superstition; among contemplative mystics, they could mimic seraphic raptures; among self-tormenting ascetics they could submit to the most grievous self-inflicted severities.

This is an interminable theme, and would require at least one whole lecture to do it anything like justice. We can only furnish a few cursory illustrative particulars, by way of specimens.

In England, the Jesuits, at an early period, despairing of being able, by direct means, to seduce the Protestants back to Popery, their next grand expedient was, to weaken Protestantism, by creating divisions and discords, schisms and heresies, amongst its adherents. In order the more effectually to accomplish this end, they resolved to take the necessary oaths, and to feign themselves to be members and ministers

two of his brethren. What occasioned still greater scandal was, that the mandarins who had been some time acquainted with part of the facts, *collected correct depositions to establish his crimes, and announced them at full length in their sentence, which they made public*. He was condemned to death with the other Jesuits, on the 22d September 1748, and they were both strangled in prison.” So much for the vow of “perpetual chastity!”

of the Church of England—such hypocritical conformity being declared to be *not a sin, but meritorious*—the parties taking the oath with an intention to promote or advance the Romish faith. Accordingly, in the guise of Anglican priests, these Jesuits, “instead of drawing their deluded followers off to Popery, pretended the most unbounded zeal against it, inveighing most bitterly against the Pope and the Latin mass, and comparing the English Liturgy to it.” One of the earliest conformists of this description, in an interview with the Pope, confessed that he had reviled his Holiness, and railed at the Church of Rome among the English heretics. “How,” said the Pope, somewhat taken aback and surprised, “How, in the name of Jesus, Mary, and all the saints, hast thou done so?” “Sir,” was the reply, “I preached against set forms of prayer, and I called the English prayers English mass, and have persuaded several to pray spiritually and extempore; and this has so much taken with the people, that the Church of England has become as odious to that sort of people whom I instructed as mass is to the Church of England; and this will be a stumbling-block to that Church, while it is a Church”—on which the Pope was not only satisfied, but “commended him, and gave him a reward of two thousand ducats for his good service.”

In India, on the other hand, the same principle of expediency led them repeatedly to swear, in a manner the most solemn, that they were genuine Brahmans—Brahmans of the purest and most uncontaminated lineage—Brahmans who could trace their pedigree direct to the mouth of the god Brahma. There, too, they retained and sanctioned many abominable idolatrous practices; while, to gain superior influence, and earn to themselves lasting renown, they exhibited some of the most dreadful austerities of Hindu asceticism.\*

\* On this department of the subject, a masterly and authoritative dissertation will be found in No. III. of the *Calcutta Review*; to which the reader is earnestly referred. Here we note only two or three of the particulars.

Mark, *first*, the progress of the zealous but extravagant enthusiast, Xavier. Finding the people of India ignorant, superstitious, credulous, does he intrepidly set about the benevolent work of instruction? No; he induces a few more absurd rites, and a few more spurious objects of worship; and forming a coalition between heathenism and corrupted Christianity, he baptizes multitudes wholesale, leaving them as ignorant of any vital truth as before. Finding the people much given to spells, and charms, and incantations, he strives to outrival the wonder-workers, and maintain his influence by an ever-ready appeal to numberless pretended miracles. On account of all these services in the cause of truth, knowledge, and benevolence, the Papists have now a Novena, or nine days' devotion annually, in honour of him who rendered them! and on that occasion they heap upon him a profusion of epithets not less extravagant than they are blasphemous and profane. Look, again, at his relation, Geronimo Xavier, who was sent on a special errand to the Mogul Court, at a time when the Emperor Akbar aimed at the formation of a new religion, or scheme of eclecticism that might unite Hindus, Mohammedans, Parsis, and even Jews and Christians, in one body. What an opportunity for expounding the pure unadulterated truth of God! Was the opportunity improved? On the contrary, in accordance with the crooked policy of his order, he presented the emperor with a translation of the Gospels into Persian, which he took care to intermingle with many of the popular Persian legends, in the fond hope that they might thus be rendered more palatable to the imperial taste. The wily Jesuit had outwitted himself, as he deserved. The impious artifice, we are informed, had “an effect directly contrary to that which was designed. Akbar was disgusted with meeting with legends of whose falsehood he had been previously convinced, and thenceforth regarded Christianity with suspicion.” Alas! alas! that an occasion so seasonable should be irredeemably lost, and the Gospel of salvation itself brought into discredit and contempt, through the chicanery of its professed friends. Once more, consider the career of Robertus De Nobilibus, the celebrated founder of the Madura mission. He studied not only the vernacular, but the Sanskrit, or sacred



Proceeding still eastward, we find in China and Japan, the most fearful identity in the proceedings of the Jesuits. From the latter country their villanies eventually procured their utter extermination. In the former, they long indulged in their ingenious devices—their impious and fantastic tricks. With their wonted art, they studied the temper and character, the taste and inclination, of the inhabitants; and having discovered no small degree of inquisitive curiosity, associated with a singular devotedness to their own hereditary philosophy and arts, they resolved to gain influence by out-stripping the native philosophers and artists in their own peculiar walk. In this they succeeded—adding somewhat of their own, such as the dialectics of the schools, and the art of casting cannon! But no branch of knowledge of a noble or generous character did they cultivate. On the contrary, in furtherance of their own sinister designs, they were wont to deny the truth, and fabricate untruth. To humour the Chinese taste for antiquity, they declared “that Jesus Christ had been known and worshipped in their nation many ages ago.” To gratify the Chinese predilection for Confucius, they endeavoured to persuade the Chinese emperor and nobility “that the primitive theology of their nation, and the doctrine of their great instructor and philosopher, Confucius, differed almost in nothing from the doctrine of the Gospel.” To swell the number of their proselytes, instead of instructing them in the genuine doctrines of Christianity, they taught them “a corrupt system of religion and morality, that sat easy upon their consciences, and was reconcilable with the indulgence of their appetites and passions.” They not only tolerated, but even countenanced, the retention of many profane opinions, and superstitious rights, and idolatrous customs. Yea, to such a pitch of daring did they proceed, that, having found the people scandalized by the doctrine of a *crucified* Redeemer—a doctrine which has ever been “to the Jews a stumbling-block and to the Greeks

language of India. Was it in order truly to enlighten the people? No; but in order the more effectually to impose on them his own system of error. For this end, he fabricated or forged various books in the style and peculiar stanza of the Vedas—the oldest and most venerated of the Hindu Shastras. These literary forgeries, or religious impositions, he endeavoured to palm upon the ignorant, under the distinguishing names of the different Vedas—as if they were the real Vedas of India. Nor was this all. Having discovered that the natives had a prejudice or aversion towards Europeans, he boldly denied his being a European—giving out that he had come from a region in the north of India, called Rome. Having also found that the Brahmans were held in the highest veneration, and exercised an unlimited authority over the people, he next assumed the appearance and title of a Brahman—besmearing his countenance, and otherwise imitating their manners and their dress. Finding, further, that of all Brahmans, the Sanyasis, or real ascetics, were the most highly esteemed, being treated with something like divine honour, he professed himself to be a Sanyasi, and *outwardly* appeared to subject himself to the most terrible austerities; though *privately* he was understood freely to indulge in most of the delicacies and luxuries which Europe or Asia could supply. But he did not stop even here. When doubts began to be raised about the reality of his Brahmanhood, he produced an old, dirty, and smoky parchment in which he had forged, in the ancient Indian characters, a deed, setting forth “that the Brahmans of Rome, in Northern India, were of much older date than those of Southern India; and that the Jesuits of Rome descended in a direct line from the god Brahma! And when the validity of his claims of genealogical descent from Brahma, and the genuineness of the forged document brought to prove it, were called in question by the scepticism even of credulous Indians, he convened a public assembly of Brahmans, and in their presence banished all further scepticism, by declaring upon oath “that he derived really and truly his origin from the god Brahma!” How could the interests of true religion and morality be promoted by such pious frauds—such lying ingenuity—such detestable perjuries?

foolishness"—they actually denied *the fact* that Christ was ever crucified! Nay, more, they denounced the fact as a base calumny, that must have been invented by the blaspheming Jews, to throw contempt on the Gospel of Christ! Ah! what *impious concealment* of principle have we here! After this, can any baseness be imputed to them that is *antecedently* incredible?

Passing from the Old World to the New, we find still the same sort of system, and the same sort of men to promote it. Neither the waters of the Pacific nor of the Atlantic can wipe away the leprous taint of Jesuitism. In the New World they came in contact with the untutored minds of simple Indians—very different from the pre-occupied minds of Chinese and Hindus. But the willow-like pliancy of their system does not forsake them. Having discovered the natural inclinations and propensities of any people, they studiously comply with these, and as studiously avoid anything calculated to give offence. Having noticed the easy, good-natured indolence of one tribe, such as the Irraquois, they frame a catechism of religious and useful knowledge to suit their taste. Of this catechism, a copy, with a translation annexed, fell into the hands of Dr Mather. It consists chiefly of questions like these:—"How is the soil made in heaven?—It is a very pure soil; they want neither for meat nor clothes; we have only to wish and we have them. Are they employed in heaven?—No; they do nothing—the fields yield corn, beans, pumpkins, and the like, without tillage. What sort of trees are there?—Always green, full and flourishing. But how are their fruits?—In this respect they excel ours, that they are never wasted; you have no sooner plucked one than you see another hanging in its room," &c., &c. Having met with another tribe so ferocious that it could listen to nothing with patience, save accounts of the execution of scalping knives and tomahawks, they, with unheard-of audacity, actually declared that the meek and lowly Jesus was a mighty chieftain and successful warrior, who, in three years, had scalped innumerable men, women, and children!! Can the force of sinful blaspheming compromise proceed further than this?

On the subject of *personal disguise* it were endless to dilate. To this dishonest and disreputable practice they were wont, at all times, in all places, and under all circumstances, unscrupulously and unblushingly to resort.\* This notorious and habitual practice of the Jesuit

\* A few specimens, by way of illustration, may here be supplied:—

The Jesuit Sammier, when traversing Europe, to excite the Popish sovereigns against his own king (that of France), was proved to have assumed all manner of forms;—now, that of a common soldier—then, that of a peasant—and anon, that of a priest—with many more.

The Polish Jesuit De l'Aigle, as the Romish Abbé, De la Roche Arnauld, informs us, when the French army was penetrating into Russia, pretended to be a Frenchman, in order to deceive the French. "He followed," says the Abbé, "our troops for a long time in the uniform of a French soldier; and it is said that he acted thus according to orders transmitted from the Court of Russia. Be that as it may, he contributed largely to the overthrow of a French battalion, by information which he conveyed to a general of the Russian armies: and if we may believe the Jesuits themselves, he did more injury to Napoleon than the whole military force of the Czar."

Bishop Carleton, in 1627, says: "When Parsons and Campion came secretly into England, they changed their exterior habit and apparel, that they might the better pass unknown. Sometimes they went like ruffians—sometimes like ministers—sometimes like noblemen—sometimes like soldiers—sometimes like apparitors; they walked

fraternity has often been exposed and reprobated, even by respectable Romanists themselves.

As early as 1558 we find this memorable judgment left on record: "There is a fraternity, which has lately arisen, called the Jesuits, who will seduce many; who, acting for the most part like the Scribes and Pharisees, will strive to overturn the truth. They will go near to accomplish their object; for they transform themselves into various shapes. Among Pagans, they will be Pagans; among Atheists, Atheists, Jews, among Jews; and Reformers, among Reformers; for the sole purpose of discovering your intentions, your hearts, and your desires. These persons are spread over the whole earth. They will be admitted into the councils of princes; which will, however, be no wiser for their introduction. They will infatuate them so far as to induce them to reveal the greatest secrets of their hearts; they will be in no way aware of them. This will be the consequence of their advisers neglecting to observe the laws of God and of his Gospel, and conniving at the sins of princes." Who supplies this partly historic and partly prophetic sketch?—An ill-natured Protestant? No; but George Bronswell, the Romish archbishop of Dublin.

We cannot, however, pursue this branch of the subject any further at present. These brief notices on the subject of *concealment*, *compromise*, and *disguise*, in the practices of the Jesuits, must serve at once to illustrate and establish the charge of systematic duplicity which we have brought against them. And having thus illustrated and established the charge, we may now let loose upon them the pointed and indignant comments of a recent English author. With him, we ask, why all this secrecy—all this concealment—all this disguise? "If their principles were good, they could surely bear the face of day. If their deeds were good, why be so secret—why hold their candle under a bushel in this way? The reason is plain enough for the simplest child to discern. They loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. Like bats and owls, and creeping, crawling, slimy things, night suits them better than the day. Unlike the soaring eagle, which bathes its splendid plumage in the light of heaven, the vulture brood cower on folded wing in the dark caverns of the earth. Unlike the honest-hearted Christian, who soars upwards on the wings of faith and love, and bathes his spirit in the beams of the divine radiance, drinking in the glorious light which emanates from the Sun of Righteousness, courting, too, the scrutiny of the world, and letting his light shine before men, to the glory of his Father and his God, the Jesuits grovelled low in earthly pursuits, shunned the light of day, courted disguise and obscurity, or revelled in the murky glare of false opinions and a vicious philosophy, and hid their principles and their objects from

secretly from recusants' houses to recusants' houses; and when Ballard came to effect the deliverance of the Queen of the Scots, he came in a soldier's habit, under the feigned name of Captain Foscue."

In a series of letters discovering the scheme projected by France in 1759, it is said: "Sometimes they (*i.e.*, the Jesuits) pass for merchants, tradesmen, stewards, publicans, farmers, and of every kind of trade. They affect ignorance to mark their designs. Sometimes Dumont brought a female with him into company, whom he (a Jesuit) made to pass for his wife. Many of the Jesuits did the same; they made a convenience of them, to disguise their affairs, and to prevent their place of meeting from being suspected."

the gaze of mortal man in fear and trepidation. There is something repugnant to manly feeling in all this—there is something diametrically opposed to the spirit of the Gospel in this—there is something pre-eminently unchristian and dishonest in this. We like to see a man not ashamed of his right name, not ashamed of his right trade, not ashamed of the party to which he belongs—above board, open, honest, with a clear brow and erect head. But the Jesuit, who conceals his right name, hides his real object, contracts his brow, and disowns his party, is as contemptible as he is dangerous, and to be scorned as much as he is to be feared. Give me, any day, the open enemy rather than the secret foe. Rather let me meet any man, than the disguised assassin, the soft-treading, oily-tongued, smooth-skinned hypocrite, who will plant a Judas-kiss on your brow, and a dagger in your heart's core. The unblushing Infidel, the bold and reckless Atheist can be better met, and is a far less dangerous foe to Christianity, than the slippery, turning, vanishing, masking, equivocating Jesuit."

*Fourthly*, Let us look to the practices of the Jesuits, in reference to their public crimes, or crimes against the State and society at large.

Truly has it been said that, wherever they gained a footing, "their evil principles brought forth evil practices. They were troublesome and turbulent, living in political agitation, fermenting the public mind, fomenting it into endless quarrels, marshalling party against party, prejudicing subjects against their sovereigns, and poisoning the minds of sovereigns against their subjects. They annoyed kings, they clogged the wheels of government, and inoculated the people with seditious and turbulent disaffection. They thus contrived to make themselves everywhere detested. Even Romish States grew sick, wearied out, and disgusted with their endless conspiracies, plots, quarrelling, intrigues, and revolutions."

Passing by all actions of a more private and debatable character, let us glance at a few of a more public nature, that have earned for them a "bad eminence" of fame in the pages of authentic history.

Look to Holland. Who, in 1584, trained and encouraged the murderer of the Prince of Orange, and even consecrated him for the bloody deed?—History proves that it was the Jesuits.

Look to Portugal. Who, for nearly two hundred years, filled that country with revolts and massacres, usurpations and conspiracies—fortifying the leading agents in every tragedy by their counsels, and providing them with absolutions?—History proves that it was the Jesuits.

Look to Poland. Who produced the series of miseries and crimes from which that unhappy kingdom—"declining gradually, until it fell into that state of torpor which rendered it an easy prey to its ambitious neighbours—never recovered?"—The celebrated Polish historian of the Reformation declares, that he "has no hesitation in answering emphatically, that it was the Jesuits."

Look to France. Who instigated, planned, and directed the wholesale massacre of St Bartholomew's Day, in which a *hundred thousand* innocent Protestants cruelly and treacherously fell, their mangled bodies lying in heaps and their blood staining the rivers with a purple dye, thus adding another fearfully scarlet stain to the Mother of Har-

lots?—History has proved that it was the Jesuits. Who fomented the rebellion, and consolidated the unnatural league in France against Henry III., which terminated with his assassination?—History proves that it was the Jesuits. Who, by their sermons, and writings, and counsel, and secret cabals, promoted the numerous intrigues against Henry IV., and were responsible for all the excesses of the long civil war that desolated the kingdom during his reign? Who nourished the assassins of that amiable monarch, sanctifying the horrid deed before its commission by the celebration of the most sacred solemnities?—History proves that it was the Jesuits.

Look to England. Who, during the thirty years of Elizabeth's reign, excited civil wars, plots, and seditions, without intermission there? Who secured from the See of Rome "a pardon to be granted to any one that would assault the queen; or to any cook, brewer, baker, vintner, physician, grocer, surgeon, or of any calling whatsoever, that would make away with her; and an absolute remission of sins to the heir of that party's family, and a perpetual amnesty to them for ever?"—History proves that it was the Jesuits. Who employed Parry to assassinate the queen?—He himself confessed on the scaffold that it was the Jesuits. They "had confessed him, absolved him from the intended crime, consecrated him, and administered the sacrament to him, to comfort him in the commission of her murder!" Who, at the same time, brought it to pass, that "excommunication and a perpetual curse should light on the families and posterity of all those of the mother Church that would not promote or assist, by means of money or otherwise, Mary Queen of Scotland's pretence to the crown of England?"—History proves that it was the Jesuits. By whom was the projected invasion of England by the invincible Armada chiefly planned?—By the Jesuits. Who attempted, by bribery, to seduce a Scottish gentleman to murder James VI.?—It was Creighton, a Jesuit. Who was mainly instrumental in contriving, with such satanic ingenuity, the gunpowder plot, which was to involve in one grand catastrophe the king, and royal family, and all the leading Protestant peers of the realm?—It was Garnet the Jesuit, who, on the scaffold, confessed and gloried in his guilt, and who has ever since been honoured by the Jesuits as a *martyr*, and included in their *litany to the saints*!

If time permitted, we might glance, in like manner, at other European States; and from these pass over to Africa, Asia, and America; and everywhere would we find the Jesuits creating disturbances, exciting tumults, fomenting quarrels, conspiracies and treasons, and perpetrating the most abominable crimes.\*

\* The case of Abyssinia or ancient Ethiopia in Africa, may furnish an example, by way of *specimen*.

There, at first, the Jesuits fawned, flattered, and caressed. Having at length gained the ear of the emperor, and, through that, dominion over his heart, they dropped the methods of argument and persuasion, and resorted to the more summary ones of fire and sword. Instead of communicating *knowledge of any kind*, a terrible persecution was raised. Thousands were hanged, and burnt, or driven to the dens and caves of the earth. Viewing a field strewn with the carcasses of eight thousand unoffending peasants, who, for conscience' sake, laid down their lives, the grandees ventured to address the emperor with tears in their eyes, saying: "Sire, how many dead bodies lie here! These are not the bodies of Mohammedans or Heathens, but of

As we have already summoned a jury, not of Protestants, but of Papists, to decide on the *morality* of the Jesuits, so now might we summon a jury of Romanists, to save us the trouble of returning a verdict on their *practices*. For this purpose the materials are quite redundant. But we must hasten on to a close.\*

Christians, your highness' natural born subjects—our blood and kindred. Though you conquer, you thrust a sword into your own bowels. How many thousands have been massacred!—how many thousands must be, before Popery can be established in Ethiopia! For God's sake, let the people alone with the religion of their forefathers; which you must either do, or ruin the empire with your own hands." Soon afterwards, the emperor, having detected the cruel advisers of these massacres, plotting against his own life and throne, resolved to get rid of such dangerous allies. They were ignominiously expelled the kingdom, and prohibited, under pain of death, from ever more revisiting it.

But the genuine spirit of their proceedings may, perhaps, be best illustrated by specially fastening our attention on the fact, that the awful process of consecrating the intended assassins for their bloody deeds became with them an habitual process. The design of such horrible consecration was "to nerve their hands and harden their hearts against any rising compunctions of conscience, by inducing them to suppose that they were solemnly consecrated by God to the special work of killing the obnoxious person, as a highly meritorious and praiseworthy act."

Of the form of consecration in such cases, Stephen, in his "Spirit of the Church of Rome," gives the following account:—"The person," says he, "persuaded by the Jesuits to assassinate a king or prince, is taken to a secret chapel, where they have prepared upon an altar a great dagger, wrapped up in linen cloth, together with an Agnus Dei. Drawing it out of the sheath, they sprinkle it with holy water, and fasten to the hilt several consecrated coral beads, pronouncing this indulgence, that as many blows as the regicide shall give the prince, he shall deliver so many souls from purgatory. After this ceremony, they place the dagger in the regicide's hand, with this recommendation: 'Thou chosen son of God, take the sword of Jephthah, the sword of Samson, the sword of David, wherewith he cut off the head of Goliath; the sword of Gideon, the sword of Judith, the sword of the Maccabees, the sword of Pope Julius II., wherewith he cut off the lives of several princes, his enemies, filling whole cities with slaughter and blood. Go, and let prudence go along with thy courage. Let God give new strength unto thine arm!' After which they fall down on their knees, and the superior of the Jesuits pronounces the following: 'Come, ye cherubim, ye seraphim—thrones and powers! Come, ye holy angels, and fill up the blessed vessel with an immortal glory! Do ye present him every day with the crown of the blessed Virgin Mary, of the holy patriarchs and martyrs. We do not look upon him now as one of ours, but as one belonging to you. And thou, O God! who art terrible and invincible, and hast inspired him in prayer and meditation to kill the tyrant and heretic for to give his (or her) crown to a Catholic king, comfort, we beseech thee, the heart of him we have consecrated to this office. Strengthen his arms, that he may execute his enterprise. Clothe him with the armour of divine power, that, having performed his design, he may escape the hands of those who shall go in pursuit of him. Give him wings, that his holy members may fly away from the power of impious heretics. Replenish his soul with joy, comfort, and light, by which his body, having banished all fear, may be upheld and animated in the midst of dangers and torments! This being ended, they conduct the regicide to another altar, where hangs an image of James Clement, a Dominican friar, who with a poisoned knife killed Henry III. of France. His image is surrounded with angels, who protect and carry him to heaven. The Jesuits show it to him, and place a crown upon his head, saying, 'Lord, regard here the arm and the executor of thy justice; let all the saints arise, bow, and yield to him the most honourable place amongst them!' Afterwards, he is not permitted to speak to any one, but to four Jesuits deputed to keep him company."

\* It may be well, however, to furnish a few *specimens* of the decisive nature of the evidence here referred to; since *particulars* must ever leave a more distinct impression on the mind of the reader than any merely *abstract* or *generalized* statements.

"Ever since the town of Poitiers had been obliged to allow the establishment of the Jesuits," says Sully in his Memoirs, "I received nothing but complaints, by word or by letter, against those fathers from the bishop, the lieutenant-general, and the principal inhabitants, either separately or collectively. These complaints came not only from the Protestants, but from the Catholics themselves."

In a comparatively recent work by the French Abbé, Martial Marcet de la Roche Arnauld, himself once an enthusiastic admirer of the Jesuits, and still a devoted adherent of the Romish See, there are very remarkable disclosures and denunciations.

From the rapid review now given of the rise and progress, the objects and designs, the principles and the practices of Jesuitism, brief

Both have been extorted by the force of truth and the promptings of a troubled conscience. A few extracts from the *introduction* of the work will suffice.

"I will not shrink," says he, "from avowing, that the desire of becoming acquainted with a company (the Jesuits) which was making so much noise in Europe, emboldened me to enter it (the college) without any previous knowledge of its sentiments or intentions. I was received with those marks of esteem and respect which are rarely shown, except to men of extraordinary merit, or of tried character. Though young (for I was then only sixteen) I may venture to say, that I had acquired a kind of celebrity, and my name was known, not only to the principal Jesuits of France and Rome, but even to some noble Congregationists, whom I shall mention in the course of this work.

"What strange disclosures might I not have published! I have summoned to the bar of public opinion only a small number of Jesuits; there still remain THREE HUNDRED formidable members whom I have not unveiled, but whom I shall unveil at a future time. I have seen their manœuvres, and I am constrained to expose to the public only some facts—which are mere trifles compared with those which I for the present suppress. Suffice it to say, that during the time I was among them, I incurred the danger of losing my liberty and life for having been the most candid and liberal of men. The regard, the indulgence, the caresses, the menaces, the persecutions, the outrages of that Society—all failed to make me view with indifference and apathy the secret wiles and culpable practices which they employ. At the horrible aspect of those pertinacious and daring men (the recollection still makes me shudder) I averted my eyes through terror; and, on seeing the sanctuary of peace sullied with all the horrors of crime and imposture, I trembled at the thought of being within its walls. I resolved to escape as soon as I could without danger; and when, with incredible precipitation, I exclaimed: Just Heaven! can any honest man live among them?

"They were powerful; for such was the will of kings. They assassinated princes, and disturbed empires; but this was the fault of those who held the reins of government.

"That the Jesuits were the disturbers of kingdoms, the oppressors of nations, the masters of the world, I freely admit.

"Even in the breast of childhood they are endeavouring to plant the germs of war. Their system of education seems to be nothing more than an experiment or trial of the terrible commotions which they are preparing for the whole world. Why does so enlightened a government as ours tolerate them, or suffer a single Frenchman to be brought up among them?

"Do you wish to excite troubles—to provoke revolution—to produce the total ruin of your country? Call in the Jesuits—raise up again the monks—open academies, and build magnificent colleges for those hot-headed religionists. Suffer those audacious priests, in their dictatorial and dogmatical tone, to decide on affairs of State, to attack, condemn, and revile those sacred laws which have been rendered necessary by the misfortunes of nations, and by the progress of the human mind. Suffer them, also, in their regret for institutions that no longer exist, to overthrow and destroy, by their ridiculous sophisms, the fundamental principles of society and of government; let them sow the seeds of hatred and dissension in all minds, and, armed with a superior authority, let them goad the people till they tear to pieces and destroy each other for opinions which they themselves do not understand."

As early as the year 1554, a judgment was publicly recorded, in these terms, viz., that "the Society, withdrawn from the obedience and submission due to authorities, unjustly deprived both temporal and spiritual lords of their rights, brought discord into every form of government, and occasioned among the people many subjects of complaint, many law-suits, altercations, schisms, and jealousies; that it appeared dangerous to all that concerned the faith, and calculated to disturb the peace of the Church." Who struck off this bold outline? Not a Protestant, but an intensely Romish body—the Faculty of Theology in Paris, in reply to an inquiry of the French Parliament.

Last of all, we may adduce the testimony of the Pope himself. In the celebrated bull by which the order was finally suppressed in 1773, Clement XIV. thus proceeds: "In vain did they (that is, his own predecessors in the See of Rome) endeavour, by salutary constitutions, to restore peace to the Church, as well with respect to secular affairs, with which the Company ought not to have interfered, as with regard to the missions; which gave rise to great disputes and oppositions on the part of the Company, with the ordinaries and communities of all sorts in Europe, Africa, and America, to the great loss of souls and the great scandal of the people: as likewise concern-



and imperfect as it confessedly is, what a fearful chapter is opened up in the history of human obliquity! But, revolting though it be, a tithe has not been told. Enough, however, has been narrated to excite a salutary fear, not unaccompanied with moral indignation and horror—enough to challenge and demand the most searching scrutiny. The picture is so harrowing that the easy, and good-natured, and unthinking may be incredulous. This I cannot help. Such I beseech to come and see—to search the authentic records of history and judge for themselves. I ask no more. Declamation has nothing to do here. The bare, naked, literal, facts of the case, do, in multiformity of abomination and horror, vastly outstrip all the conceptions of the most exaggerative declaimer—all the worst realities of the historic, yea, and all the wildest fictions of the tragic muse! After the fullest investigation of the subject, I can only say, that my statement is lame, inadequate, and utterly disproportioned to the impression which manifold concurrent evidences have stamped indelibly on my own mind. To the *principles* of the Jesuits may, as we have proved, be truly applied the awful designations of “the deceivableness of unrighteousness—the mystery of iniquity—the perfection of devilism.” To the *practices* of the Jesuits may not inappropriately be applied the words of Sir James Mackintosh, in reference to the reign of terror in France: “The only series of crimes, perhaps, in history, which, in spite of the common disposition to exaggerate extraordinary facts, has been beyond measure under-rated in public opinion. Men’s minds were oppressed by atrocity and the multitude of crimes; their humanity and their indolence took refuge in scepticism from such an overwhelming mass of guilt; and the consequence was, that all these unparalleled enormities, though proved with the fullest historical evidence, were at the time only half believed, and are now scarcely half remembered.”

Strange and anomalous spectacle! Strange and revolting infatuation! They call themselves, in a distinguishing sense, by the name of Jesus—that very name which was divinely chosen to denote that He

ing the meaning and practice of *certain idolatrous ceremonies* adopted in certain places: and further, concerning the use and explication of certain *maxims*, which the Holy See has, with reason, proscribed as *scandalous and manifestly contrary to good morals*; from which maxims have resulted *very great inconveniences and great detriment*, both in our days and in past ages, such as *the revolts and intestine troubles* in some of the Catholic States.” “Under the reign of Clement XIII. the times became more difficult and tempestuous—complaints and quarrels were multiplied on every side; in some places dangerous seditions arose, tumults, discords, dissensions, scandals, which, weakening or entirely breaking the bonds of Christian charity, excited the faithful to all the rage of party hatreds and enmities. Desolation and danger grew to such a height, that the very sovereigns, whose piety and liberality towards the Company were so well known as to be looked upon as hereditary in their families—we mean our dearly beloved sons in Christ, the kings of France, Spain, Portugal, and Sicily—found themselves reduced to the necessity of expelling and driving from their states, kingdoms, and provinces, these very companions of Jesus; persuaded that there remained no other remedy for so great evils; and that this step was necessary in order to prevent the Christians from rising one against the other, and from massacring each other in the very bosom of our common mother, the Holy Church.”

Surely we have here, at least, reached the very climax of authority on the subject. Let Romanists affect to hesitate, if they will, however unreasonably, respecting our judgment of the Jesuits—let them affect to hesitate, if they will, however more unreasonably still, respecting the judgment of Popish kings, Popish judges, Popish theologians, Popish universities; yet, surely, no Romanist can consistently call in question the deliberate judgment of an infallible Pope!



who bore it was so called because he was “to save his people from their sins,” even as he himself “did no sin, and in his mouth was found no guile;” and yet, as if unconscious of the aggravated turpitude of the contrast, they forswear their own moral independence; hold themselves, by oath, prepared to *sin*, at the mandate of an erring mortal; and labour, with all the energy of untiring zeal, and all the artifices of an exhaustless subtlety, in teaching the myriads of Adam’s sinful race how to sin—ay, and sin, too, habitually and systematically, with full and absolute impunity! With the ensigns of peace and good-will blazoned before them, and songs of freedom on their lips, these hosts go forth into all lands, to trample on the thrones of kings, to foment insubordination among subjects, to bind the conscience in fetters, and stifle the first breath of rational liberty! Holding the torch of illumination in one hand, they carry in the other a multiplex apparatus of devices and expedients for extinguishing or concealing “*the true light*,” which ought to lighten every man that cometh into the world! Professing themselves disciples of the Anointed and Crucified One, they yet virtually deny that blessed name, deprive his cross of its virtue and its meaning, make shipwreck of his faith, and drench the earth with the blood of his faithful martyrs! Unparalleled, ineffable effrontery! They gravely designate themselves “a Society not of men, but of angels, having the spirit of eagles—the lights of mankind, the preceptors of all the world, the reformers of manners, who have banished vice, and made virtue to flourish;” and then go forth, with a thousand witching spells and sorceries, to garnish vice and embellish crime—to canonize error, and consecrate lies—to convert profligacy into virtue, and virtue into profligacy—to weaken the moral hatred of sin, deprave the heart, and brutalize the soul—to extinguish every vital principle of social and spiritual regeneration, and disinherit all future ages of the richest treasures of the knowledge, experience, and wisdom of the past!

### *The Suppression and Restoration of the Jesuits.*

But, hark! a voice from the Sacred Oracle breaks upon the ear, saying: “Pride goeth before destruction, and an haughty spirit before a fall.” “I have seen the wicked great in power, and spreading himself like a green bay tree. Yet he passed away, and, lo, he was not: yea, I sought him, but he could not be found.” How strikingly have these words been verified in the marvellous rise and disastrous downfall of the Jesuits! Wearied, at length, and worn out by their unscrupulous rapacity and all-grasping ambition—their treacheries and stratagems—their seductions and bribes—their intrigues and cabals—their laxation of public morals and disturbance of social order—their fomenting of seditions, disloyalties, and rebellions—their instigating of massacres, and parricidal cruelties, and royal assassinations;—the monks and courtiers, judges and civil magistrates, churches and public schools, princes and emperors of all nations in Europe, Asia, Africa, and America—all, all successively united their efforts in sweeping them clean away, and causing their institute to perish from off this earth, and from under these heavens.

And when the kings and senates and judges of Europe, the chieftains of Africa, the Emperors of Asia, the commonwealths of America, were all found united successively in its condemnation—when the civil rulers of all lands had actually decreed its destruction as a public nuisance, and the civil subjects of all realms had joyfully assisted in celebrating its funeral obsequies—the credit, the honour, yea, and the very safety and existence of the Papacy itself, seemed to demand from its head an act of repudiation or abolition too. Long and anxious was the inquiry—agonizing and terrible the mental conflict, on the part of the Papal head, Clement XIV.—“the virtuous Ganganelli,” as he is usually termed. At last, however, his mind was made up; and in July 1773, the bull of suppression was launched forth, under the signet of “the Infallible.” “After a mature deliberation” (is the language of this most important instrument) “we do, out of our certain knowledge, and the fulness of our apostolical power, *suppress and abolish* the said Company;” “abrogate and annul its statutes, rules, customs, decrees, and constitutions, even though confirmed by oath, and approved by the Holy See, or otherwise.” “We declare all, and all kind of authority—the general, the provincials, the visitors, and other superiors of the said Society—to *be for ever annulled and extinguished*,” “so that the name of the Company *shall be, and is, for ever extinguished and suppressed*.” “Our will and pleasure is, that these our letters should *for ever and to all eternity be valid, permanent, and efficacious* have and obtain their full force and effect, and be *inviolably observed by all and every whom they do and may concern, now or hereafter in any manner whatever*.”

The decree was passed—the deed was done—bravely and effectually done. But, poor Clement!—the concoction of it cost him years of excruciating anguish—the actual execution cost him his life. The Jesuits had their revenge—a full and fell revenge. For who ever, from the monarch on the throne to the meanest of his subjects—who ever crossed their path, thwarted their designs, or defeated their measures with impunity? No, not even his Holiness himself, whom, with blasphemous adulation, they were often wont to designate “Christ’s Vicar—the Holy Father—the Lord God the Pope!” Clement knew all this, and distinctly anticipated nothing short of death as the price or penalty of his daring magnanimity. Immediately on signing the instrument of suppression, he coolly remarked: “The suppression is accomplished. I do not repent of it, having only resolved on it after examining and weighing everything, and because I thought it necessary for the Church; and if it were not done I would do it now; but this suppression will be my death.” These words were soon proved to be fatally prophetic. On the walls of St Peter’s a significant warning shortly afterwards appeared, in the form of a pasquinade, which Clement himself interpreted to mean: “The Holy See will be vacant in September.” Before September, in order to verify the oracle, several attempts were actually made to destroy him by poison, but failed. In June, the following year (1774), however, he was suddenly cut off—exclaiming on his death-bed, in allusion to the secret cause: “I am going to eternity, and I know for what.” His throat, stomach, and intestines, we are assured by the eye-witnesses of the tragical scene,

“were in a state of the highest inflammation; and immediately after death his whole body turned black, his flesh fell off, and he became so offensive, although remarkably thin, that it was impossible to approach him.”

In other words, there could be no doubt at all that the Pope died by poison; still less could there be any doubt, from the entire concurrent circumstances of the case, that the Jesuits were the administrators of the fatal potion, and that his Holiness was the victim of their vengeance. Thus did they “close their first career with a crowning deed, worthy of their iniquitous principles, and their former execrable conduct;” and thus appeared to perish, perish for ever, the most terrific system of lawless despotism which ever scourged the earth, or strove to convert its hamlets and its palaces into a second Pandemonium. No wonder though the world, which had groaned under its “disastrous twilight” should rejoice! No wonder though one wide and universal shout of jubilee should be heard among the nations! No wonder though the wise and the good of all kindreds and tribes, while yet the smarting under the scars and gashes which it had inflicted, and rejoicing in its downfall, as the triumph of justice, mercy, and humanity, should proclaim, as with one voice, that he who endeavoured any more to “let it loose upon society, must be chargeable with high treason against the common interests and happiness of his species!”

But time, the mighty leveller, rolled on; and with it brought its usual cycle of change. With the extinction of the system, the memory of its intrinsic evil and dangerous excesses had gradually passed into oblivion too; and ere the generation in the ears of whose youth and infancy its death-knell was heard to sound, had wholly quitted the stage of time, it was doomed to listen to the tidings of its sudden revival and unexpected re-appearance in fulness of strength and renovated energy.

It is not for us to reconcile Papal inconsistencies and downright contradictions. We can only wonder at the total abnegation of reason and common sense—the utter and absolute dementedness which the Papacy, at every turn, exacts from its votaries as the sole substratum of their faith, and the indispensable condition of their allegiance. Here is a precious specimen! a system which one infallible had pronounced to be “scandalous, and manifestly contrary to good morals,” is by another, revived, as essential to the salvation of holy mother Church! A system which one infallible had repudiated and cast out as a loathsome and deadly thing—positively interdicting any from intermeddling therewith, either now or hereafter—was soon caught up, fondled, and endearingly cherished by another! A system which one infallible had sentenced to be suppressed, abolished, and extinguished for ever—ay, and as if that were not explicit enough—for *ever and to all eternity*, is restored, within less than half a century, to the full plenitude of its peculiar rights and privileges, by another! As if in the Popish calendar “for ever” and “all eternity,” meant only a brief period of time, extending from 21st July 1773, to 7th August 1814! But, be that as it may, the fact is undoubted, that, in an ill-omened hour, and as if in derision of the figment of assumed infallibility, Pope Pius VII., in 1814, did reverse and abrogate the decree of his infallible predecessor

in 1773! In his bull of restoration, he employs these striking and memorable words:—"We should deem ourselves guilty of a great crime towards God, if, amidst these dangers of the Christian republic, we neglected the aids which the special providence of God has put at our disposal; and if, placed in the bark of Peter, tossed and assailed by continual storms, we refused to employ *the vigorous and experienced rowers* who volunteer their services in order to break the waves of a sea which threaten every moment shipwreck and death."

He then proceeds, "in virtue of the plenitude of apostolic power, and with perpetual validity," to decree the restoration of the order, with all necessary powers, that all States "may freely and lawfully receive all who desire to be admitted" into it; with power granted to the members "freely and lawfully to apply themselves to the education of youth, to direct colleges and seminaries, to hear confessions, to preach, and administer the sacraments." And not satisfied with all this, the bull is directed to be "inviolably observed according to its form and tenor in all time coming, and never to be submitted to the judgment or revision of any judge, with whatever power he may be clothed; declaring null and of no effect any encroachment on these regulations, either knowingly or from ignorance;" and finally asseverating, that "no one be permitted to infringe, or by an audacious temerity, to oppose, any part of that ordinance; and that should any one take it upon him to attempt it, he would thereby incur the indignation of Almighty God, and of the holy apostles, Peter and Paul."

Here, then is the bark of St Peter launched forth anew, to buffet all storms, and bear down all opposition, under the guidance of "the vigorous and experienced rowers" who have once more "volunteered their services." And "vigorous and experienced rowers they truly are," as an anonymous home journalist has emphatically remarked, "if the bark of St Peter is to be conducted through a sea of blood—if the Pope really design to follow the track of a Gregory or a Hildebrand, and wade through slaughter to the throne of bigotry and mental despotism!" For what is the first principle of this celebrated order?—"That Jesuitism is to be maintained at the expense of society at large." And what its second?—"That the end sanctifies the means." Who, then, can deny that almost all-powerful and ubiquitous institutions, based upon such principles, and saturated throughout with the spirit of such principles, *fairly threaten* once more to throw open the flood-gates of bigotry and intolerance—to roll back the swelling tide of mental, moral, and social improvement—to nullify the sacred rights of conscience—to obliterate the dear-bought privileges of civil and religious liberty, and shroud all nations in the mantle of a fearful and ever-thickening gloom?

And now that the system has been introduced amongst us, tightening the cords that bind fast the victims of Rome's deceitful policy—insinuating its subtle poison into the very bosom of our Protestant families—assaying to delude the great and the mighty, by forging illusions, phantasms, and dreams of tolerance and knowledge, and striving to insert the edge of its cleaving wedge into the chinks and crevices of Hindu society—is it not high time that we should awake, and arise out of sleep? Is it not high time that we should be re-burnishing our

spiritual weapons, and re-investing ourselves with "the whole armour of God?" Against the might and the resources of a power so mysterious—a power nowhere wholly visible, and yet everywhere wholly felt—it may seem vain and presumptuous in us to contend. And so it would, if we went forth in our own name and strength. But it is not thus we go. Knowing that it is not by "the might or power" of man, but by the energy of Jehovah's Spirit, that the strongholds of wickedness are to be brought down, we go forth, not as principals, but as hearty though unworthy allies and auxiliaries, in the mighty contest. We go forth "to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty;" not because "He needs our help, but expects our duty." We go forth, in the full assurance that our weakness will only serve to magnify his almighty strength, and our imperfections his all-sufficiency. And who can tell but the humble agency of such expository services as the present may be blessed from on high as one of the instrumentalities in defeating the powers of darkness and gaining a spiritual conquest over the nations? Without his blessing, all agency, however potent, must prove like the "bruised reed;" with his blessing, all agency, however impotent, must prove like the resistless thunderbolt. Oh! how one breath of his almighty Spirit would scatter to the winds of heaven all the devices and policies, whether of wicked angels or of wicked men! When commissioned by him, a swarm of feeble flies sufficed to mortify the pride of Egypt's haughty potentate! When commissioned by him, a few innocuous undulations of the air, from trumpets and broken pitchers, routed and put to flight the countless hosts of Midian! When commissioned by him, a small, smooth, round pebble from the brook, flung by a stripling's arm, laid prostrate in the dust the mighty champion who daringly defied the armies of the living God!

What, then—would I advocate anything like intolerance or persecution? God forbid! While I abominate the system of Jesuitism, I can love the souls of all who are enslaved by it, whether its authors or its victims. The system I would labour to destroy, by all legitimate weapons of exposure, and argument, and reprehension, and earnest appeal; the persons of the men I would not hurt—no, not even touch a hair of their heads. I would not, in the mistaken zeal of a disciple of old—a zeal so timeously rebuked by the disciple's Master—I would not, if I could, call down fire from heaven to consume even the adversaries of truth and righteousness—oh, no! I have not so learned Christ. In imitation of his Spirit, I would strive, if I only knew how, to go about continually, doing them all the good which they might allow me to do. And, if all effort failed, I would, in imitation of the divine Redeemer, endeavour to betake myself to prayer. It was amid his dying agonies, and in behalf of his cruel persecutors, that he breathed forth the sublime and soul-thrilling intercession: "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do." Moved by so divine and touching an example, ought we not fervently to pray, alike for the conscious authors and the unconscious victims of a system that is winged with pestilence and death? And what should be the burden of our prayer? Surely that the unconscious victims might be speedily delivered from the delusions under which they are now held captive

and spell-bound; surely that the conscious authors, whose danger must be imminent, and excite alarm in proportion to their consciousness of guilt, might have their ears unstopped, and their deafness removed, so that they could hear!—that the scales of thick darkness might be made to drop from their spiritual vision, and they were made to see!—that the Lord might, in undeserved mercy, be pleased to convert their souls, however stoutly they may have hitherto resisted or despised *His* arm, who wields the thunder! In this way only would we strive to overcome evil with good. In this way only would we strive to revenge ourselves for any malice or treachery that may have been exhibited—even by heaping coals of fire, in loving-kindness, upon their heads.

It was the dying expression of one of Scotland's most celebrated martyrs—the Marquis of Argyll—an expression which has since thrilled through many a Scottish heart, and lighted up the flame of a martyr's zeal in many a Scottish bosom: “I die with a heart-hatred of Popery.” In like manner, whilst I would have you to be inspired with love for the souls of the men, I would have you to cherish a never-dying hatred of their principles. I would have you to go forth from these walls, this night, ready to take up the mantle dropped by the noble martyr, and animated with a double portion of his spirit, saying: “I live, and, by the blessing of God, am determined to die, with a heart-hatred of Popery; and, above all, with a heart-hatred of Jesuitism, which is Popery in its richest blossom and ripest fruitage.”

Suffer not, oh! suffer not yourselves, I beseech you, to be captivated and ensnared by the siren song, that Popery is not now what it once was—that it is wholly altered in its features. That Popery may be—that it has been heretofore—checked, controlled, and limited by the overbearing pressure of external circumstances, is undoubted; but I do hereby, this night, solemnly protest and proclaim, in the sight of heaven and of earth, my own inflexible conviction that Popery is unchanged and unchangeable in its spirit and purposes—that it wants only the opportunity and the power *now* to lighten up every land with the blazing stake, and drench every shore with the blood of martyrs. It was not in figure, or in envy, or with any hostile intention, but with feelings akin to those of exultation and triumph, that a recent author thus emphatically expressed himself: “Evidence has satisfied us more potently than ever, that Romanism has in it a power and energy which (humanly speaking) is irrepressible; that it resembles a vegetable seed, which may be buried in a mummy-case for three or four thousand years, and yet, if dropped into the ground, would incontinently spring up in vigorous development; that what was said of the royal strumpet of Egypt may almost be said of the Church of Rome:—

‘Age cannot wither her, nor custom stale  
Her infinite variety.’”

It is, then, with no ghostly shade, with no fleeting or unsubstantial phantasm, that we are called on to contend. Oh! no; it is with the realest, the most tremendous power that has yet manifested its presence on the stage of time—a power whose past history well entitles us to say of it, that

“Black it stood as night—  
Fierce as ten furies—terrible as hell.”

Or, seizing the illustration of the sovereign Pontiff himself, let us remember that he anticipates and distinctly speaks of on approaching season of storms and tempests, with their sable retinue of waves and shipwreck, and death. And we, too, anticipate, though in another sense, a season of gloom—a night of storms, such as has not yet been realized since the world began. Even now may be discerned the indubitable signs and presages of coming trouble—the horizon, now lurid with gathering clouds and an unbroken gloom—now streaked and vivified with strange meteors and lightning splendours; the cloudless noon, now disturbed by the rolling of mysterious thunders—now darkened with the shadows of a portentous twilight; the air and all ocean, now seized with a freezing unnatural stillness, and now agitated and convulsed with explosive shocks, as from the invisible elements of the nether world; at shining eve, the night suddenly ascending without a star, to give place to the uprisen day, which seems but a paler night; while the sun, the glorious sun, is often seen to withdraw—

“Not as he wont, with clear and golden fires;  
Bewildered in a labyrinth of haze,  
His orb, redoubled with discoloured rays,  
Struggles and vanishes; along the deep,  
With slow array, expanding vapours creep,  
Whose folds, in twilight's yellow glare uncurl'd,  
Present the dreams of an unreal world—  
Islands in air suspended, marching ghosts  
Of armies, shapes of castles, winding coasts,  
Navies at anchor, mountains, woods, and streams,  
Where all is strange, and nothing what it seems;  
Till deep involving gloom, without a spark  
Of star, moon, meteor—desolately dark—  
Seals up the vision.”

It is amid such signs and portents of a gathering storm, that shall soon burst in fury over the nations, that the bark of Peter, we are assured by the sovereign Pontiff, has been launched forth to course over the ocean of time. But can this be the genuine bark of Peter which has been so launched forth, and to which we are so earnestly invited to intrust our spiritual and everlasting interests? What! this the bark of Peter, the holy and devoted apostle, which is freighted, not with goodly or wholesome commodities, but with sorceries to enchant, and deadly poisons to infatuate and destroy, the souls of men!—this the bark of Peter, the holy and devoted martyr, which has been committed to the pilotage and management of “vigorous and experienced rowers,” whose sole vocation, for three hundred years, has been to prowl along every shore—hoisting false signals to allure the unwary to the shoals and quicksands on which they must inevitably perish; and extinguishing each beacon-blaze that would have guided the tempest-tossed mariner to a haven of safety and of rest! Rather, must not this be the armed bark of a ruthless pirate, whose pennons are red with the blood of innumerable victims, and whose rowers

“grin horribly a ghastly smile” as they coolly gaze at the havoc and desolation which they spread all around? Then let each one of us exclaim: “O my soul, come not thou into their secret; unto their assembly, mine honour, be not thou united!”

But, bounding athwart the fearful gloom, and steadily poised on the foaming billows—behold! behold! another bark appears full in view! It is the ark of the everlasting covenant!—with the flag of mercy waving from on high, and the lamp of salvation shining underneath—with the bread of life and the waters of immortality for her burden—with the ordinances of grace for her expanded sails, and the SPIRIT’S influences for the gales that fill them—with patriarchs, and prophets, and apostles, for her rowers, and the great Angel of the Covenant himself for her commander and helmsman! Thither, thither, then, let us speed and make haste; for the vessel is chartered for IMMANUEL’S land, and into it all, all are freely invited to enter, “without money and without price.” Once caught up into its bosom, we shall, in spite of the rage of earth and hell, and the fury of contending elements, reach in safety the happy shore—where, with the countless throng that have been delivered out of great tribulation, and have “their robes washed and made white in the blood of the Lamb, we shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more; neither shall the sun light on us nor any heat; for the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed us, and shall lead us unto living fountains of waters; and God shall wipe away all tears from our eyes.”

---

*N.B.*—From the very nature of the subject discussed in the preceding pages, it is clear that the real value of the discussion must depend on the *facts*, rather than on its *reasonings*. In treating of such a theme, the main desideratum is, a collection of *varied* and *authentic facts*. To collect such facts, therefore, from every available source, and arrange them in an orderly and digested form, has been the *chief end* aimed at by the author. References to authorities have not been supplied, nor the grounds of preferring the testimonies of some to those of others, as these are so multitudinous that the bare mention of them would swell the work (already rather large) to an utterly disproportionate bulk. Of this, however, the reader may be assured, that not a single fact is stated, from beginning to end, without what appeared to the mind of the author an ample sufficiency of evidence in favour of its authenticity.





